DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 100 SP 039 150

AUTHOR Zelazek, John R.; Williams, Wayne W.; McAdams, Charles; Palmer, Kyle

TITLE Teacher Education Follow-Up Study, 2000: A Summary of First and Second Year Teachers, Graduate Students, and Their Employers with Respect to State and National Standards.

INSTITUTION Central Missouri State Univ., Warrensburg.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 140p.; For the 1998 study, see ED 418 063.
AVAILABLE FROM Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg, MO 64093-5086. Tel: 660-543-8691; Fax: 660-543-4382.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Alternative Teacher Certification; Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Students; Higher Education; National Standards; Preservice Teacher Education; Principals; State Standards; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Competencies; *Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS Central Missouri State University

ABSTRACT

This report represents the 12th follow-up study by the Teacher Education Assessment Committee at Central Missouri State University (CMSU), Warrensburg. This year's surveys were distributed to preservice, first-year, and second-year teachers in Missouri, graduate students, alternative certification teachers, and employers (principals) of the school's graduates. Results indicated that 65 percent of CMSU's previous year's graduating class secured full-time teaching positions within Missouri as compared to 79 percent for the prior year. Teacher education graduates (first-year and second-year teachers only) were employed in 171 of Missouri's 525 districts. Students in Foundations of Education classes were predominantly female, white, and full-time. The average salary for graduates was $24,415. Most new teachers planned on teaching 5 or more years from the time they began teaching. First- and second-year teachers perceived their level of competence as strong. Most principals hiring CMSU graduates believed the teachers they hired were well-prepared and competent. Surveys of CMSU graduate students and their employers provide data on students' perceptions of their competence and their employers' perceptions of their competence. Data are presented for the attitudes of first- and second-year teachers and their principals, graduate students and their employers, and alternative certification teachers and their principals. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Central Missouri State University

ED 440 100

Teacher Education Follow-up Study 2000: A Summary of First and Second Year Teachers, Graduate Students, and Their Employers with Respect to State and National Standards

by the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC)

Dr. John R. Zelazek, Chair
Dr. Wayne W. Williams
Dr. Charles McAdams
Dr. Kyle Palmer

Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, MO 64093-5086
660-543-8691 or 4235, FAX 660-543-4382
zelazek@cmsu1.cmsu.edu
April, 2000

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. R. Zelazek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP039150

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Topic		Page
I.	Background and Discussion	2-5
II.	Undergraduate Surveys (1999-2000)	6-12
	Foundations of Education (1999-2000) 6	
	Student Teachers (1999-2000) 7-9	
	CBASE Data (4/88—3/00) 10-12	
III.	First and Second Year Teachers and Principal Surveys (1999-2000)	13-60
	First and Second Year Teachers 14-16	
	Elementary Education First and Second Year Teachers 17-19	
	Agriculture First and Second Year Teachers 20-21	
	Art First and Second Year Teachers 22-23	
	Biology First and Second Year Teachers 24-26	
	Business First and Second Year Teachers 27-28	
	Earth Science First and Second Year Teachers 29-30	
	English First and Second Year Teachers 31-32	
	Family and Consumer Science First and Second Year Teachers 33-34	
	Industrial Technology First and Second Year Teachers 35-36	
	Modern Language First and Second Year Teachers 37-38	
	Mathematics First and Second Year Teachers 39-40	
	Middle School First and Second Year Teachers 41-42	
	Music First and Second Year Teachers 43-44	
	Physical Education First and Second Year Teachers 45-46	
	Physical Science First and Second Year Teachers 47-48	
	Social Science First and Second Year Teachers 49-50	
	Special Education First and Second Year Teachers 51-53	
	Speech Pathology and Audiology First and Second Year Teachers 54-55	
	Speech Theatre First and Second Year Teachers 56-57	
	Principals of First and Second Year Teachers 58-60	
V.	Graduate Students and their Employers Surveys (1997-1999)	61-128
	Graduate Students—School Counselors 62-70	
	Employers/Principals of School Counselors 71-72	
	Graduate Students--Library/Media Specialists 73-77	
	Employers/Supervisors of Library/Media Specialists 78	
	Graduate Students—Special Education Teachers 79-86	
	Employers/Principals of Special Education Teachers 87	
	Graduate Students--Speech Pathologist/Audiologist 88-97	
	Employers/Principals of Speech Pathologist/Audiologist 98-101	
	Graduate Students--Teachers Curriculum and Instruction 102-108	
	Principals of Teachers Curriculum and Instruction 109	
	Graduate Students--Reading Teachers K-12 110-114	
	Principals of Reading Teachers K-12 115	
	Graduate Students—Administration 116-126	
	Superintendent of Principals 127	
	School Board Presidents of Superintendents 128	
VI.	Alternative Certification Surveys (1992-1999)	129-138
	Alternative Certification Teachers 129-133	
	Principals views of Alternative Certification Teachers 134-136	
	Alternative Certification Teacher Applicants (DNP/Denied) 137-138	

3 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Background

This report represents the twelfth Follow-Up Study by the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University (Central), Warrensburg, Missouri. TEAC was established in April of 1988. TEAC's current committee members are as follows: John R. Zelazek, Wayne W. Williams, Charles McAdams, and Kyle Palmer.

TEAC is a centralized system of data collection and assessment that conducts and publishes results of periodic assessments and evaluations of Central's Teacher Education Programs by soliciting input from: A) Central's Professional Education Faculty; B) Pre-service teacher education candidates at Central; C) Graduates of Central's undergraduate teacher education programs; D) Employers (principals) of educators who were prepared by Central, and E) graduates who completed MS, MSE and Ed.S. degrees in Education. The results of all assessments and evaluations are shared with all departments involved in teacher education programs. TEAC provides specific information to individual departments for use in the advisement and counseling of students as well as program revision and course development. Demographic trends of teacher education classes, at both elementary and secondary levels, have been tallied, analyzed and distributed in order to help in load assessment, needs assessment, future planning for program adjustment, and personnel management. The use of TEAC survey data has been helpful to the University, so that it can look at the whole picture rather than fragmented pieces.

TEAC and the Office of Institutional Research and Testing Services have jointly developed a data-base of 16,300 past and present Central students and coordinates that data with the Office of Clinical Services and the Teacher Education Council. TEAC designed four major surveys based on Freeman's (1988) research. TEAC compiles information for the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and NCATE accreditations and the North Central Association assessment. The results of TEAC's findings have been shared with the appropriate CMSU steering committees for accreditation reports.

Discussion

This year's set of surveys resulted in an overall 61% return rate (1974 out of 3215) for all surveys distributed to pre-service, first and second year teachers in Missouri, graduate students, alternative certification teachers, and employers of our students.

The data revealed that 65% of Central's previous year's graduating class (1998-1999) secured full-time teaching positions within the State of Missouri as compared with 79% for 1997-1998 graduates.

Central's teacher education graduates, first-year and second-year teachers only, are employed in 171 of the 525 districts across the State of Missouri. Of those Central graduates employed as full-time teachers in the Missouri public school systems, 73% were employed in school districts that reside within a 90-mile radius of CMSU.

Students in Foundations of Education classes were predominantly (76%) female. Nine percent listed their cultural backgrounds as other than white. Eighty-nine percent were full-time students. When asked to rate their academic background, the Foundations students rated Non-Western philosophies and cultures as their weakest area (11th consecutive year) and the Humanities as their strongest.

Seventy-nine percent of the 1999-2000 student teachers were females. Ninety-seven percent were white. The students rated their student teaching experience very high as consistent with responses from previous student teachers, and their advice/counseling received from academic advisors as weakest (11th consecutive year). When asked to rate their perception of their level of competence for the DESE/MoSTEP standards, the student teachers perceived themselves as strong or above in all ten areas.

The average salary for Central graduates (First-year and Second-year teachers) was $24,415. Ninety-three percent of the first and second year teacher respondents classified themselves as white. Eighty-six percent were full-time students while completing their undergraduate degree. Sixty-five percent of the survey respondents plan to work on graduate degrees in education with forty-three percent planning to complete their graduate work at Central. Ninety-three percent of the first and second year teacher respondents were full-time classroom teachers.

Eighty-four percent of the first and second year teacher survey respondents survey respondents planned on teaching five years or more from now. Fifty-six percent found it necessary to obtain employment outside their school system during the school year. Eighty-eight percent stated they would enroll in a teacher preparation program again. The teachers' top three areas of dissatisfaction in their current positions were salary/fringe benefits, level of support from parents and community, and opportunities for professional advancement.

The first and second year teachers perceived their level of competence based on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MOSTEP) standards as strong. Individual teacher education program results are listed within the report and had similar results with respect to the DESE/MoSTEP Standards. A number of programs had very few responses making it difficult to draw conclusions from the data.

Seventy percent of the principals hiring Central's graduates who responded to the survey felt that the teachers they hired were well prepared. The principals felt that the competence of their teachers as measured by DESE/MoSTEP standards was strong.

A graduate student survey was sent to each CMSU graduate who completed a degree (August 1996 through December 1999) related to certification. Additionally, surveys were sent to each graduate's employer if their employer was known. All graduate programs were assessed using DESE MOSTEP Standards or individual program National Standards.

The Counselor Education graduates did not agree with 10 of the 26 statements relating to their program and perceived themselves as being less than strong in 11 of 13 DESE standards. The graduates had concerns about the development of research skills and technology use with in the program. However, their employers perceived them as being strong in all DESE standards.

Library/Media Specialists graduates did agree with 24 of the 26 statements relating to their program and perceived themselves as being strong in 4 of the 5 standards as listed in the American Association of School Librarians position statement on the School Library Media Supervisor. Employers of Library/Media Specialists perceived the graduates as strong on all standards.

Special Education graduates agreed with 23 of the 26 statements relating to their program and perceived themselves as being strong in 9 of 10 DESE/MOSTEP standards. The graduates did have concerns about technology use being integrated into instruction. The Special Education employers perceived the graduates as being strong in all DESE/MoSTEP standards.

Speech Pathology/Audiology graduates did agree with 24 of 26 statements relating to their program and rated their overall satisfaction with the program as 4.1 on a five point scale. Their employers rated the program at 4.3.

Curriculum and Instruction graduates (Elementary, Secondary, K-12, Reading, and Adult Education Programs) agreed with 21 of the 26 statements and perceived themselves as strong in all 10 DESE/MoSTEP standards. The C/I graduate employers also perceived the graduates as being strong in all DESE/MoSTEP standards.

Reading graduates did not agree with 15 of the 26 statements relating to their program and perceived themselves as strong in all 10 DESE/MOSTEP standards. The graduates were most concerned about how their programs were monitored and that their program should reflect cultural diversity and exceptionalities. The Reading graduate employers perceived the graduates as being strong in all DESE/MOSTEP standards.

Administration graduates agreed with 20 of the 26 statements relating to their program and perceived themselves as being less than strong in 6 of 12 National Policy Board of Education Administration (NPBEA) standards. The graduates were most concerned with technology and information systems. The Superintendents perceived their principals (CMSU graduates) as being strong in 10 of 11 NPBEA standards. The School Board Presidents perceived that their superintendents (CMSU graduates) as strong in only 5 of the 11 NPBEA standards.

Alternative certification graduates perceived themselves as being strong in 7 of 10 DESE/MoSTEP standards. The principals, who employ the alternative certification graduates, perceive that their teachers (employees) as strong in 8 of the 10 DESE/MoSTEP standards.

Foundations of Education—CMSU School Year 1999-2000

Of the 361 Foundations of Education students enrolled during the 1999-2000 school year, 295 (82 % Return) completed the survey.

1. Males--72 2. Females—224 3. Age: 22.7 years

4. Are you a Post-Bachelor Student? Yes—27, No--259

5. How would you describe yourself?

3	Native Indian
2	Asian or Pacific Islander
5	African American
1	Hispanic
284	White

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

265	Full-time student
11	Part-time student
16	Sometimes full-time/part-time

7. When do you plan to complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

8	Spring 2000 through summer 2000
53	Fall 2000 through summer 2001
145	Fall 2001 through summer 2002
72	Fall 2002 through summer 2003
18	Other_____

8. How do you rate your academic background in each of the following areas?

		very weak	weak	adequate	strong	very strong
3.4	Mathematics	1	2	3	4	5
3.4	Social Studies	1	2	3	4	5
3.3	Natural Sciences	1	2	3	4	5
3.7	Humanities	1	2	3	4	5
3.3	Multi-cultural issues and perspectives	1	2	3	4	5
2.8	Non-Western philosophies and cultures	1	2	3	4	5
3.6	American history	1	2	3	4	5
3.4	American literature	1	2	3	4	5
3.2	Education/historical/philo. development	1	2	3	4	5
3.2	Contemporary educational issues	1	2	3	4	5
3.1	Theories/principles of how students learn	1	2	3	4	5
3.4	Child/adolescent growth and development	1	2	3	4	5
3.1	Social and political roles of schools in USA	1	2	3	4	5
3.1	Classroom management techniques	1	2	3	4	5
3.1	Legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	1	2	3	4	5

Student Teachers—CMSU School Year 1999-2000

Of the 308 Student Teachers enrolled during the 1999-2000 school year, 278 (90% Return) completed the survey.

1. Gender: Male--57 Female--212 2. Average age in years—25.8

3. What was (will be) your marital status at the time you complete certification?

Single—156 Married—99 Divorced--14

4. How many minor children do you have living with you?

None—189 One—31 Two—34 Three or more--14

5. How would you describe yourself?

Native American—2, Asian or Pacific Islander—1, African American—2, Hispanic—3, White--266

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

Full-time student—253, Part-time student—2,
Sometimes full-time/part-time--14

7. When will you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

Fall 1999—101 Spring 2000—140 Summer 2000--20

8. On a scale of one to five, how would you rate the overall quality of:

	Weak				Strong
3.9 Your teacher preparation program	1	2	3	4	5
3.8 Courses in your undergraduate major field	1	2	3	4	5
3.5 Courses in your minor field(s) (may not apply)	1	2	3	4	5
3.5 The liberal arts/gen. ed. courses you have taken	1	2	3	4	5
4.5 Your student teaching experience	1	2	3	4	5
3.5 Advice/counseling you received from your depart. advisor (in your major field(s) of study)	1	2	3	4	5
2.9 Advice/counseling you received from academic advisor	1	2	3	4	5
3.8 Support, assistance, and general help from faculty and staff in your education program	1	2	3	4	5

9. To what extent have education courses (other than field-based experiences such as student teaching) contributed to your success as a teacher?

Very significant—38, Significant—118, Moderate—97,
Insignificant—12, Very insignificant--4

10. How would you rate your preparation to teach in culturally diverse settings?

Excellent—10, Good—95, Average—94, Weak—31, Poor--7

11. How would you rate your preparation to teach AT RISK students?

Excellent—30, Good—83, Average—87, Weak—87, Poor--13

12. Do you feel you are a(n)...

Exceptional student teacher—182, Average student teacher—73,
Below average student teacher--6

13. What is your major?

Elementary Education—117, Secondary Education—62,
Special Education—27, Middle School—14, Art—10,
Music—7, Physical Education—7, Speech Pathology/Audiology—17,
Family and Consumer Sciences—2, Agriculture—2, Industrial Technology—1.

14. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.2 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.4 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.4 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.4 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.4 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.4 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.3 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.3 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.4 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.6 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community tosupport student learning and their well being.

Central's CBASE RESULTS
4/15/88---3/23/00

Students who wish to complete a teacher education degree in Missouri need to successfully complete the College Basic Academic Subjects Examination, CBASE, as part of the admission process for acceptance into the teacher education program at Central. This requirement became effective on September 1, 1988 as part of the 1985 "Excellence in Education Act." CBASE is a criterion-referenced achievement examination focusing on the knowledge and skills requisite to successful college course work. It contains five examination areas: Writing, English, Math, Science and Social Studies. Since the first offering of CBASE in April of 1988, 5016 students have submitted test scores to the university as part of their teacher education admission process. The following page shows a matrix per test, by number of successful attempts, unsuccessful attempts with frequencies, and percentages. The left-hand column of the matrix requires the following explanation in order to interpret the data:

1 = First attempt, successful

2 = Second attempt, successful

3 = Third attempt, successful

4 = Fourth attempt, successful

5 = Fifth attempt, successful

6 = Sixth attempt, successful

7 = Seventh attempt, successful

8 = Eighth attempt, successful

9= Ninth attempt, successful

A = First attempt, unsuccessful

B = Second attempt, unsuccessful

C = Third attempt, unsuccessful

D = Fourth attempt, unsuccessful

E = Fifth attempt, unsuccessful

F = Sixth attempt, unsuccessful

G = Seventh attempt, unsuccessful

H = Eighth attempt, unsuccessful

I = Ninth attempt, unsuccessful

English	Frequency	Percent
A	177	3.5
B	23	.5
C	7	.1
D	11	.2
E	2	<.1
G	2	<.1
H	1	<.1
1	4452	88.7
2	252	5.0
3	59	1.2
4	17	.3
5	13	.3
6	2	<.1
7	2	<.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Writing	Frequency	Percent
A	118	2.4
B	20	.4
C	8	.2
D	10	.2
E	3	.1
G	2	<.1
H	1	<.1
1	4527	90.2
2	244	4.9
3	54	1.1
4	19	.4
5	11	.2
6	2	<.1
7	2	<.1

Math	Frequency	Percent
A	258	5.1
B	35	.7
C	13	.3
D	8	.1
E	7	.1
F	5	.1
G	2	<.1
H	1	<.1
I	1	<.1
1	4273	85.1
2	245	4.9
3	99	2.0
4	38	.8
5	19	.4
6	11	.2
7	4	.1
8	1	<.1
9	1	<.1

Science	Frequency	Percent
A	310	6.2
B	34	.7
C	10	.2
D	2	<.1
E	1	<.1
F	2	<.1
G	1	<.1
1	4134	82.3
2	407	8.1
3	73	1.5
4	29	.6
5	11	.2
6	2	<.1
7	3	.1

Social Studies	Frequency	Percent
A	228	4.5
B	30	.6
C	11	.2
D	5	.1
F	2	<.1
G	1	<.1
1	4271	85.1
2	318	6.3
3	91	1.8
4	37	.7
5	13	.3
6	9	.2
7	3	.1
9	1	<.1

February, 2000

Dear Educator,

On behalf of the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University, I ask your assistance in the assessment process we are currently undertaking. Please return the survey to me in the prepaid envelope by March 1, 2000.

This task is in compliance with The State of Missouri law (Excellence in Education Act of 1985), our national accreditation agency for teacher education, NCATE, and our regional accreditation agency, North Central. **We need to conduct a follow-up of students who completed certification or graduated from our programs.** These data will be used in conjunction with last year's survey and surveys that are currently being distributed by individual departments on our campus for the purpose of improvement.

I will also be contacting your principal to make him/her aware of our surveys, and ask him/her to participate in an employer' survey. All responses will be confidential. If you wish a copy of our results, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope, and I will send you a copy as soon as they are compiled.

Sincerely,

Dr. John R. Zelazek, Chair
Teacher Education Assessment Committee

First and Second Year Teachers—TEAC 2000

Of the 645 Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 323 (50% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—71 and Females—252.

2. Average age: 29.1 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—166, married—149, other—7.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $24,437.

5. How would you describe yourself?

   Native Indian—10, Asian or PI—0, Hispanic—4, White—301, African-American—4, Other--4.

5. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   Full-time—279, part-time—11, ft/pt--33.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

   Before 1997—57, 1997—46, 1998—110, 1999—103.

8. How many children do you have?

   None—178, one—47, two—59, three—23, other—13.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education?

   Yes—212, Not Sure—50, Completed—42.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—139, Not Sure—89, No—67.

11. How would you describe your current position in education?

    Full-time teacher—299, permanent substitute—12, part-time teacher—12, DTD substitute teacher—6, other—3.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time?

    <one year—171, 1 to 2 years—99, 2 years—31, other-23.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

< Five years—34, 5 to 10 yrs.—64, 11 to 20 yrs.—66, more than 20 yrs.—144.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment?

No-133, Yes-182.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

Definitely yes—175, Probably yes—112, Probably not—19, Definitely not—15.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.4	Salary/fringe benefits
4.0	Quality/level of administrative support
4.1	Level of personal challenge
3.8	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.9	General work conditions
3.9	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.9	Geographical location
3.6	Opportunities for professional advancement
3.5	Level of support from parents and the community
4.0	Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.2	Interactions with colleagues/students
4.1	Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.9 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.1 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.1 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.9 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.1 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.1 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.9 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.0 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.1 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.0 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Elementary Education-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 241 Elementary Education Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 122 (51% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—14 and Females—108.

2. Average Age: 28.2 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—63, married—58, other—1.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $24,582.

5. How would you describe yourself?

   Native Indian—4, Asian or PI—0, Hispanic—4, White—111, African-American—1, Other—2.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   Full-time—106, part-time—4, ft/pt--5.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

   Before 1997—22, 1997—16, 1998—39, 1999—43.

8. How many children do you have?

   None—66, one—15, two—29, three—7, other—5.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education?

   Yes—94, Not Sure—17, Completed—11.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—52, Not Sure—35, No—30.

11. How would you describe your current position in education?

    Full-time teacher—111, Perm. substitute—5, PT teacher—3, DTD sub-3.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time?

    <one year—71, 1 to 2 years—34, 2 years—13, other-3.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five yrs.—11, 5 to 10 yrs.—16, 11 to 20 yrs.—29, more than 20 yrs.—5

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment?

No-42, Yes—80.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

Definitely yes—67, Probably yes—43, Probably not—3, Definitely not—9.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.4	Salary/fringe benefits
3.9	Quality/level of administrative support
4.2	Level of personal challenge
3.8	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.9	General work conditions
4.0	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.9	Geographical location
3.7	Opportunities for professional advancement
3.5	Level of support from parents and the community
4.0	Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.2	Interactions with colleagues/students
4.1	Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.9 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.2 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.1 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.0 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.0 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.1 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.0 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.0 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.1 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.0 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Agriculture-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 4 Agriculture Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 2 (50% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—1 and Females—1. 2. Average Age: 31.0 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college? Married—2.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $32,000.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—2

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time—2.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—1, 1999—1.

8. How many children do you have? Two—2.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—1, Completed—1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU? Not Sure—1.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher—2.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—1, other--1.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach? 5 to 10 years—2.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? Yes—2.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Probably yes—2.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.5	Salary/fringe benefits
4.0	Quality/level of administrative support
4.0	Level of personal challenge
4.0	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.5	General work conditions
3.5	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.0	Geographical location
4.0	Opportunities for professional advancement

4.0 Level of support from parents and the community
4.5 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.5 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.0 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.0 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.0 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.0 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.0 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.5 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.5 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.0 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.0 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.0 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.0 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Art-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 25 Art Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 9 (36% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—2 and Females—7. 2. Average age: 30.4 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—4, married—4, other—1.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $23,150.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—9

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time—9.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? 1997—2, 1998—5, 1999—2.

8. How many children do you have? None—5, one—1, two—2, three—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—8, Not Sure—1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—7, Not Sure—1, No—1.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher—9.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time?

    <one year—6, 1 to 2 years—2, 2 years—1.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—1, 5 to 10 yrs.—1, 11 to 20 yrs.—3, more than 20 yrs.—4.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-3, Yes—6.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—5, Probably yes—3, Probably not—1.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

2.8 Salary/fringe benefits
3.8 Quality/level of administrative support
4.3 Level of personal challenge
3.3 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.2 General work conditions
3.9 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.7 Geographical location
3.2 Opportunities for professional advancement
3.6 Level of support from parents and the community
3.9 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.1 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.0 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.3 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.0 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.0 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.1 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.0 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

3.9 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.9 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

3.9 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.2 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.

3.6 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Biology-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 10 Biology Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 7 (70% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—4 and Females—3.

2. Average age: 29.9 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—3, married—3, other—1.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $22,828.

5. How would you describe yourself?

   Native Indian—1, White—3, African-American—1, Other--2.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time—7.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

   Before 1997—1, 1997—1, 1998—2, 1999—3.

8. How many children do you have? None—4, two—1, three—1, other—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—5, Not Sure—1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—4, Not Sure—3.

11. How would you describe your current position in education?

    Full-time teacher—4, permanent substitute—2, part-time teacher—1.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time?

    <one year—5, 1 to 2 years—2, other--1.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—3, 5 to 10 yrs.—1, more than 20 yrs.—1.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-6, Yes—1.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—2, Probably yes—2, Probably not—3.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

2.3	Salary/fringe benefits
3.7	Quality/level of administrative support
3.4	Level of personal challenge
3.7	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.9	General work conditions
3.3	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
4.4	Geographical location
3.1	Opportunities for professional advancement
3.3	Level of support from parents and the community
3.7	Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.1	Interactions with colleagues/students
4.3	Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.7 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

3.9 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

3.4 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.0 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.3 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.3 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.0 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

3.7 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

3.7 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.

3.6 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Business-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 21 Business Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 11 (52% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—2 and Females—9.

2. Average age: 29.9 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—4, married—7.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $23,800.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—10, African-American—1.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   Full-time—9, part-time—2.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—3, 1997—1, 1998—5, 1999—2.

8. How many children do you have? None—5, one—1, two—4, three—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—9, Not Sure—1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU? Yes-8, Not Sure-3.

11. How would you describe your current position in education?

    Full-time teacher--9, permanent substitute—1, DTD substitute teacher—1.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time?

    <one year—5, 1 to 2 years—2, 2 years—3, other-1.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—1, 5 to 10 yrs.—2, 11 to 20 yrs.—3, more than 20 yrs.—4.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-7, Yes—4.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—5, Probably yes—4, Probably not—1, Definitely not—1.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.2 Salary/fringe benefits
4.1 Quality/level of administrative support
4.0 Level of personal challenge
3.8 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
4.2 General work conditions
3.7 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
4.2 Geographical location
3.3 Opportunities for professional advancement
3.6 Level of support from parents and the community
4.5 Level of support from administrators and colleague.
4.2 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.1 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.8 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

3.9 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

3.8 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.7 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

3.6 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.2 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.9 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.2 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

3.9 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.

4.1 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Earth Science-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 4 Earth Science Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 2 (50% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—1 and Females—1. 2. Average age: 22.5 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college? Single—2.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $24,700.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—2.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time—2.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? 1999—2.

8. How many children do you have? None—2.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—1, Not Sure—1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU? Yes-1, Not Sure-1.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher—2.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? Other-2.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach? 5-10 yrs.—2.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-1, Yes—1.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—1, Probably yes—1.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

4.0	Salary/fringe benefits
4.5	Quality/level of administrative support
4.5	Level of personal challenge
4.5	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
4.5	General work conditions
4.0	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
4.0	Geographical location

4.0 Opportunities for professional advancement
4.5 Level of support from parents and the community
4.5 Level of support from administrators and colleague
5.0 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.5 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.5 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.5 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.0 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.0 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.5 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.5 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.5 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.0 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.5 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

3.5 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

English-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 20 English Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 11 (55% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—2 and Females—9. 2. Average age: 27.4 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—8, married—3.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $24,372.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—11.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   Full-time—9, part-time—1, ft/pt--1.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—1, 1998—8, 1999—2.

8. How many children do you have? None—8, one—1, two—2.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—6, Not Sure—3.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—5, Not Sure—4, No—2.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher-11.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—4, 1 to 2 years—6, other-1.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach? 5 – 10 yrs-2, 11-20 yrs.-4, more than 20-1.

14. In the past year have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-133, Yes—182.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—7, Probably yes—4.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

2.8 Salary/fringe benefits
3.3 Quality/level of administrative support

4.0 Level of personal challenge
3.8 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.8 General work conditions
4.0 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
4.1 Geographical location
3.9 Opportunities for professional advancement
3.5 Level of support from parents and the community
3.9 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.4 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.2 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.0 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.3 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.2 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.9 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.2 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.1 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.7 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.1 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.1 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.

4.1 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Family and Consumer Science-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 14 Family and Consumer Science Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 7 (50% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Females—7. 2. Average age: 34.4 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—1, married—6.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $23,157.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—7

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   Full-time—5, part-time—1, ft/pt--1.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—2, 1997—1, 1998—3, 1999—1.

8. How many children do you have? None—3, one—1, two—2, other—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—5, Not Sure—2.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—139, Not Sure—89, No—67.

11. How would you describe your current position in education?

    Full-time teacher—6, permanent substitute—1.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year-2, 1 to 2 years-2, 2 years-3.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—2, 5 to 10 yrs.—1, 11 to 20 yrs.—1, more than 20 yrs.—3.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-2, Yes—5.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—4, Probably yes—1, Probably not—1, Definitely not—1.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.9 Salary/fringe benefits
3.6 Quality/level of administrative support
4.1 Level of personal challenge
4.0 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
4.0 General work conditions
4.0 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.9 Geographical location
3.7 Opportunities for professional advancement
3.4 Level of support from parents and the community
3.4 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.0 Interactions with colleagues/students
3.7 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.7 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.0 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.0 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.7 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

3.9 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

3.9 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.7 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

3.7 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.1 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.

3.4 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Industrial Technology-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 6 Industrial Technology Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 3 (50% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—3. 2. Average age: 35.0 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—1, married—2.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $25,400.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—3.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time—3.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? 1999—3.

8. How many children do you have? None—2, one—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—2, Not Sure—1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU? Yes—2, No—1.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher—3.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—3.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    5 to 10 yrs.—1, 11 to 20 yrs.—1, more than 20 yrs.—1.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? Yes—3.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Probably yes—1, Definitely not—2.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

- 3.3 Salary/fringe benefits
- 4.3 Quality/level of administrative support
- 4.7 Level of personal challenge
- 2.3 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance

4.0 General work conditions
4.0 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.3 Geographical location
4.3 Opportunities for professional advancement
4.7 Level of support from parents and the community
5.0 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.0 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.0 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.0 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.0 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.0 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.0 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

3.7 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.0 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.0 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.3 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.7 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.0 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Modern Language-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 8 Modern Language Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 5 (63% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—2 and Females—3. 2. Average age: 28.8 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—4, married—1.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $25,420.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—5.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time—3, ft/pt--2.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? 1998—5.

8. How many children do you have? None—3, one—1, two—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes-3, Not Sure-1, Completed-1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU? Yes-3, Not Sure-2.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher—5.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—4, 1 to 2 years 1, 2 years—1.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    5 to 10 yrs.—3, 11 to 20 yrs.—1, more than 20 yrs.—1.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-4, Yes—1.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—5.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

- 3.8 Salary/fringe benefits
- 3.8 Quality/level of administrative support
- 4.0 Level of personal challenge
- 3.8 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance

4.2 General work conditions
3.8 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.8 Geographical location
3.4 Opportunities for professional advancement
4.2 Level of support from parents and the community
4.4 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.0 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.2 Sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.2 understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.0 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

3.6 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.6 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

3.8 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

3.8 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.2 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.2 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.0 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

3.6 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Mathematics-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 14 Mathematics Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year,7 (50% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—1 and Females—6. 2. Average age: 31.9 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—3, married—4.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $21,633.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—5.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Part-time—7.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? 1997—2, 1998—2, 1999—3.

8. How many children do you have? None—4, two—1, three—1, other—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—2, Not Sure—3.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—2, Not Sure—3, No—2.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher—7.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—3, 1 to 2 years—3.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—1, 5 to 10 yrs.—3, 11 to 20 yrs.—2, more than 20 yrs.—1.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-2, Yes—5.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—4, Probably yes—2, Probably not—1.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.8 Salary/fringe benefits
3.5 Quality/level of administrative support

3.8 Level of personal challenge
3.7 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.5 General work conditions
3.5 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.8 Geographical location
3.2 Opportunities for professional advancement
3.3 Level of support from parents and the community
3.8 Level of support from administrators and colleague
3.8 Interactions with colleagues/students
3.8 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.8 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

3.8 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

3.8 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.7 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.0 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

3.7 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.0 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

3.8 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

3.8 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

3.7 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Middle School-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 17 Middle School Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 11 (65% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—3 and Females—8.

2. Average age: 29.1 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—7, married—4.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $24,577.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—11.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time-7, part-time-4.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—2, 1998—5, 1999—4.

8. How many children do you have? None—7, two—2, three—2.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes-6, Not Sure-4, Completed-1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—4, Not Sure—5, No—1.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher-11.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—5, 1 to 2 years—5, other-1.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—1, 5 to 10 yrs.—2, 11 to 20 yrs.—4, more than 20 yrs.—4.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-5, Yes—5.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—7, Probably yes—4.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.9 Salary/fringe benefits
4.1 Quality/level of administrative support

4.3 Level of personal challenge
3.7 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
4.2 General work conditions
3.8 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
4.2 Geographical location
3.8 Opportunities for professional advancement
3.1 Level of support from parents and the community
4.5 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.5 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.3 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.6 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

3.9 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

3.9 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.7 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.0 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.1 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.7 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

3.7 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

3.8 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.

3.9 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Music-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 18 Music Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 13 (72% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—3 and Females—10. 2. Average age: 32.9 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—6, married—6, other—1.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $24,371.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—13

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time—12, ft/pt--1.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—6, 1997—3, 1998—1, 1999—3.

8. How many children do you have? None—5, one—4, two—3, three—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes-7, Not Sure-3, Completed-2.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes-2, Not Sure-3, No-4.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher-13.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—4, 1 to 2 years—6, other-3.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—4, 5 to 10 yrs.—6, more than 20 yrs.—3.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-3, Yes—9.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—5, Probably yes—8.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

- 3.5 Salary/fringe benefits
- 4.7 Quality/level of administrative support

4.2 Level of personal challenge
3.7 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.9 General work conditions
3.9 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
4.0 Geographical location
3.3 Opportunities for professional advancement
3.8 Level of support from parents and the community
4.6 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.4 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.0 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.2 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.2 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.2 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.2 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

3.9 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

3.9 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.1 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

3.8 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.2 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.2 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Physical Education-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 53 Physical Education Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 22 (42% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—9 and Females—13. 2. Average age: 29.6 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—12, married—10.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $24,880.

5. How would you describe yourself? Native Indian—3, White—19.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   Full-time—19, part-time—1, ft/pt--1.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—3, 1997—7, 1998—8, 1999—4.

8. How many children do you have? None—12, one—5, two—2, three—2, other—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes-13, Not Sure-2, Completed-5.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—14, Not Sure—4, No—3.

11. How would you describe your current position in education?

    Full-time teacher—20, permanent substitute—2.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year-11, 1 to 2 years-8, 2 years-2.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—3, 5 to 10 yrs.—4, 11 to 20 yrs.—3, more than 20 yrs.—12.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-15, Yes—7.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—12, Probably yes—6, Probably not—1, Definitely not—3

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.6	Salary/fringe benefits
4.3	Quality/level of administrative support
4.3	Level of personal challenge
4.1	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
4.0	General work conditions
4.1	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
4.0	Geographical location
3.8	Opportunities for professional advancement
4.1	Level of support from parents and the community
4.3	Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.3	Interactions with colleagues/students
4.3	Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.2	I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.
4.5	I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.
4.4	I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.
4.3	I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.
4.2	I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.
4.3	I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
4.1	I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
4.0	I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.
4.4	I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.
4.0	I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Physical Science-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 11 Physical Science Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 3 (27% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—2 and Females—1. 2. Average age: 37.0 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—1, married—2.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $25,033.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—3.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time-2, part-time-1.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? 1998—1, 1999—2.

8. How many children do you have? None—1, one—1, two—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes-1, Not Sure-1, Completed-1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU? Yes-1, Not Sure-2.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher—3.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—2, 2 years—1.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach? < Five years—2, 5 to 10 yrs.—1.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-2, Yes—1.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—1, Probably yes—1, Probably not—1.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

- 3.3 Salary/fringe benefits
- 3.3 Quality/level of administrative support
- 4.3 Level of personal challenge
- 2.7 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
- 4.1 General work conditions
- 4.3 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace

2.7 Geographical location
3.7 Opportunities for professional advancement
4.3 Level of support from parents and the community
4.7 level of support from administrators and colleague
4.5 Interactions with colleagues/students
3.0 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.7 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.0 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.3 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.0 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.0 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

3.7 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.7 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.7 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.7 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

3.7 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Social Science-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 45 Social Science Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 24 (53% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—15 and Females—9. 2. Average age: 26.7 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—12, married—11, other—1.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $24,333.

5. How would you describe yourself? Native Indian—1, White—23.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   Full-time—20, part-time—1, ft/pt--2.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—4, 1997—3, 1998—7, 1999—9.

8. How many children do you have? None—13, one—4, two—2, three—4.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes-19, Not Sure-3, Completed-2.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—9, Not Sure—10, No—5.

11. How would you describe your current position in education?

    Full-time teacher—23, permanent substitute—1.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year-12, 1 to 2 years-9, 2 years-3.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—1, 5 to 10 yrs.—5, 11 to 20 yrs.—2, more than 20 yrs.—14.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-13, Yes—11.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—15, Probably yes—7, Probably not—1, Definitely not—1.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.8	Salary/fringe benefits
3.9	Quality/level of administrative support
4.0	Level of personal challenge
3.6	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.7	General work conditions
3.7	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.9	Geographical location
3.6	Opportunities for professional advancement
3.1	Level of support from parents and the community
4.1	Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.2	Interactions with colleagues/students
4.0	Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.8 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

3.8 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

3.7 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.9 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.1 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

3.7 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.7 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

3.9 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

3.9 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.

3.9 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Special Education-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 84 Special Education Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 42 (50% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—4 and Females—38. 2. Average age: 28.89 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—12, married—16, other—3.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $23,985.

5. How would you describe yourself? Native Indian—1, White—41,

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   Full-time—35, part-time—1, ft/pt--1.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—7, 1997—8, 1998—13, 1999—14.

8. How many children do you have? None—26, one—6, two—6, three—1, other—3.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes-28, Not Sure-4, Completed-4.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—16, Not Sure—8, No—8.

11. How would you describe your current position in education?

    Full-time teacher—41, permanent substitute—1.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time?

    <one year—17, 1 to 2 years—15, 2 years—5, other-3.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—3, 5 to 10 yrs.—9, 11 to 20 yrs.—6, more than 20 yrs.—19.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-15, Yes—27.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—21, Probably yes—15, Probably not—4, Definitely not—1.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

2.9	Salary/fringe benefits
4.0	Quality/level of administrative support
4.2	Level of personal challenge
4.1	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
3.7	General work conditions
3.9	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.6	Geographical location
3.3	Opportunities for professional advancement
3.8	Level of support from parents and the community
4.2	Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.0	Interactions with colleagues/students
3.9	Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.9 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.3 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.4 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.8 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.3 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.1 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.9 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

3.9 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.1 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.

4.0 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Speech Pathology/Audiology-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 51 Speech Pathology/Audiology Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 19 (37% Return) completed survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—1 and Females—18. 2. Average age: 28.6 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   Single—5, married—10.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $26,089.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—18, African-American—1.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time—17, ft/pt--2.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—4, 1997—2, 1998—6, 1999—4.

8. How many children do you have? None—11, one—4, three—3.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Yes—2, Completed—15.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU?

    Yes—5, Not Sure—2, No—7.

11. How would you describe your current position in education?

    Full-time teacher—17, part-time teacher—1.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—14, 1 to 2 years—3, other-2.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach?

    < Five years—3, 5 to 10 yrs.—6, 11 to 20 yrs.—4, more than 20 yrs.—5.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No-15, Yes—2.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—7, Probably yes—12.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.5 Salary/fringe benefits
4.1 Quality/level of administrative support
4.0 Level of personal challenge
3.7 Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
4.1 General work conditions
3.9 Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
3.9 Geographical location
3.7 Opportunities for professional advancement
3.6 Level of support from parents and the community
4.0 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.3 Interactions with colleagues/students
3.9 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

3.8 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.2 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.1 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.9 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.1 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.3 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.2 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.4 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.0 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for my students.

4.2 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Speech/Theatre-First and Second Year Teachers

Of the 4 Speech Theatre Graduates (First and Second Year Teachers) employed in the State of Missouri during the 1999-2000 school year, 3 (75% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—2 and Females—1. 2. Average age: 36.6 years.

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college? Married—2.

4. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary is $29,100.

5. How would you describe yourself? White—3.

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate? Full-time-3, part-time-1.

7. During which school year did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program? Before 1997—1, 1998—1, 1999—1.

8. How many children do you have? None—1, two—1, other—1.

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education? Not Sure—2, Completed—1.

10. If not completed, do you plan to do your graduate work at CMSU? Yes-1, Not Sure-1.

11. How would you describe your current position in education? Full-time teacher—3.

12. For how long have you been teaching full time? <one year—2, 2 years—1.

13. How much longer do you expect to teach? 5 to 10 yrs.—1, more than 20 yrs.—2.

14. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? Yes—3.

15. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

    Definitely yes—2, Probably yes—1.

16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.0	Salary/fringe benefits
4.7	Quality/level of administrative support
4.7	Level of personal challenge
3.3	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
4.3	General work conditions
3.7	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
4.7	Geographical location
4.0	Opportunities for professional advancement

3.3 Level of support from parents and the community
4.3 Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.3 Interactions with colleagues/students
4.3 Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

17. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.0 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.0 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

3.7 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

3.3 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.3 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.7 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.3 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.0 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.0 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

3.3 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

February, 2000

Dear Employer,

On behalf of the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University, I ask your assistance in the assessment process we are currently undertaking. Please return the survey to me in the prepaid envelope by March 1, 2000.

This task is in compliance with The State of Missouri law (Excellence in Education Act of 1985), our national accreditation agency for teacher education, NCATE, and our regional accreditation agency, North Central. **We need to conduct a follow-up of students who completed certification or graduated from our programs.** These data will be used in conjunction with last year's survey and surveys that are currently being distributed by individual departments on our campus for the purpose of improvement.

I will also be contacting your employee listed below to make him/her aware of our surveys, and ask him/her to participate in a teacher's survey. All responses will be confidential. If you wish a copy of our results, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope, and I will send you a copy as soon as they are compiled.

Sincerely,

Dr. John R. Zelazek, Chair
Teacher Education Assessment Committee

PRINCIPALS OF FIRST AND SECOND YEAR TEACHERS

Of the 371 Principals who evaluated First and Second Year Teachers (Graduates of Central and those who completed certification) during the 1999-2000 school year, 198 (53% Return) completed the survey.

1. How many Central graduates and/or post-bachelor certification graduates did you employ this school year as true first-year or second-year teachers?

   Total Teachers—345 Gender: Males—83 Females—252.

2. What are their annual average individual salaries?

   Less than $20,000—10, $20,000-24,999—121, $25,000 or beyond—43.

3. How would you describe them? Please list a number for each.

   American Indian—1, Hispanic—1, Asian or Pacific Islander—2,
   White—327, African American—9, Other—5.

4. Do you feel they are satisfied with the profession they have chosen?
   Please give a number for each choice.

   Yes—337, No—8.

5. How well prepared do you consider them for their present position?

   Very Strong—111, Strong—150, Adequate—65, Weak—15, Very Weak—4.

6. How would you describe their current positions in education? Please list numbers for each.

   Full time teacher—330, permanent substitute—6, part-time teacher—9.

7. What subject(s) do they teach? (Please list numbers for all that apply)

   Agriculture-1, Art-16, Biology-9, Business-11, Computer Science-4
   Marketing-3, Earth Science-10, Elementary-108, English-25,
   Foreign Language-4, Health-8, Home Economics-8, History-2,
   Industrial Technology-2, Journalism-4, Mathematics-17, Middle School-7,
   Music-11, Physical Education-23, Physical Sciences-14, Social Studies-29,
   Special Education-50, Speech Path/Audiology-15, Speech/Theatre-9.

8. Would you hire your first-year and second-year teachers again?

   All—125, Most—38, Some—8, None of these—2.

9. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.1 The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.1 The teacher(s) understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.0 The teacher(s) understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

3.9 The teacher(s) recognizes the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develops, implements, and evaluates curriculum based upon students, district, and state performance standards.

4.0 The teacher(s) use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.1 The teacher(s) uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.1 The teacher(s) model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.1 The teacher(s) understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

3.9 The teacher(s) is a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.1 The teacher(s) fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

This letter was sent to each student completing a graduate degree.

February 2000

Dear Educator,

On behalf of the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University, I ask your assistance in the assessment process we are currently undertaking. Please return the survey to me in the prepaid envelope by March 1, 2000.

This task is in compliance with The State of Missouri law (Excellence in Education Act of 1985), The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), our national accreditation agency for teacher education (NCATE), and our regional accreditation agency, (North Central). **We need to conduct a follow-up of graduate students who completed an MSE, MS or EDS in one of our programs.** These data will be used for the purpose of program improvement.

I will also be contacting your employer to make him/her aware of our surveys, and ask him/her to participate in the employers' survey. All responses will be confidential. If you wish a copy of our results, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope, and I will send you a copy as soon as they are compiled.

Sincerely,

Dr. John R. Zelazek, Chair
Teacher Education Assessment Committee

Follow-up Survey of Graduate Students (School Counselors)

Of the 94 Counselor Education Graduates contacted, 52 (55% Return) completed the survey.

MS—51, Ed.S.—1

School Year degree was completed, 1996—7, 1997—15, 1998—11, and 1999—10.

Program Evaluation---Please respond to the statements listed below. If you do not have enough information to respond to a specific statement, leave it blank. Please use the following Key for the first set of statements:

KEY 4 = Strongly Agree 3 = Agree 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree 0 = NA

The following statements are related to graduate instruction and your coursework at CMSU:

3.3 The graduate courses you completed helped you to become more competent as a professional educator or develop competencies that could lead to other professional roles (e.g., school library media specialist, school psychologist, principal, etc.).

3.3 The courses you took built upon and extended prior knowledge and experiences.

2.7 Through your graduate courses you developed the skills to use research and research methods.

3.2 Your coursework helped you to increase your knowledge and understanding about issues and trends to improve practice in schools and classrooms.

3.3 The instruction in your graduate courses reflected knowledge derived from research and professional practice.

3.1 Graduate faculty used a variety of instructional strategies that reflected an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.

3.2 Instruction in your graduate courses encouraged the development of reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving.

3.0 Graduate level instruction reflected knowledge about and experiences with cultural diversity and exceptionalities.

2.5 In your graduate level courses technology was integrated into instruction.

The following statements are related to internships, or field-based activities, within your graduate program at CMSU (if your graduate program did not require an internship or practicum, skip this section):

2.9 Internships, or field-based activities, were well planned and sequenced, and were beneficial.

3.0 Internships, or field-based activities, related principles and theories to actual practice in classrooms and schools.

2.8 Internships, or field-based activities, created meaningful learning experiences within a variety of communities, with students of different ages and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations.

3.2 Internships, or field-based activities, encouraged reflection by candidates and included f feedback from higher education faculty, school faculty, and peers.

The following statements are related to admission into and completion of your CMSU graduate program:

3.0 The criteria for admission to the graduate school and your specific program ensured quality candidates.

2.2 Incentives and affirmative procedures helped attract you to CMSU's graduate school.

2.7 In your opinion, the graduate student body was culturally diverse.

2.6 Your academic progress was systematically monitored with appropriate academic and professional advisement.

2.8 Your academic progress was monitored through systematic procedures and timelines.

3.2 The application of your knowledge gained through your graduate courses was assessed.

2.9 During your graduate experience at CMSU you were provided clear information about institutional policies and requirements needed for completing your degree.

3.1 A clear set of exit criteria/outcomes for completion of the degree was provided.

The following statements are related to the graduate faculty who teach courses at CMSU:

2.8 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about current practice related to the use of computers and technology.

3.2 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about and had experience with cultural differences and exceptionalities.

3.4 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were competent in research methodology.

3.6 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were knowledgeable about your selected subject/discipline.

3.1 The graduate faculty member who served as your graduate advisor was competent and knowledgeable of the graduate program.

The following statements are related to DESE/MoSTEP standards:

Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

3.9 The program prepares school counselors who know and understand human development and personality and how these domains affect learners, and applies this knowledge in his or her work with learners.

4.1 The program prepares school counselors who know and understand the principles of measurement and assessment, for both individual and group approaches, and applies these in working with learners.

3.7 The program prepares school counselors who understand career development and planning processes across the life span, and assist all learners in their career exploration, decision-making and planning.

3.7 The program prepares school counselors who know, understand, and use classroom guidance methods and techniques.

3.5 The program prepares school counselors who know, understand, and use planning and goal setting for the personal, educational, and career development of the learner.

3.9 The program prepares school counselors who know, understand and use various methods for delivering responsive counseling services to learners in the school community

3.8 The program prepares school counselors who know, understand and use various methods to develop and maintain a comprehensive guidance program that serves the needs of all learners.

3.8 The program prepares school counselors who understand, develop, and use professional relationships in the school, family and community, through consultation and collaboration, to promote development of all learners.

3.4 The program prepares school counselors who know, understand and practice in accord with the ethical principles of the school counseling profession.

4.2 The program prepares school counselors who know, understand and adhere to the legal aspects of the role of the school counselor

3.7 The program prepares school counselors who know, understand and implement methods to promote their professional development and wellbeing.

3.4 The program prepares school counselors who know and understand how human diversity affects learning and development within the context of a global society and a diverse community of families and who use this understanding to assist learners, parents, and colleagues in developing opportunities for learning.

2.8 The program prepares school counselors who know, understand and use technology as a management and counseling tool in promoting the personal, educational, social, and career development of the learner.

The following statements are related to all graduate programs at CMSU. Please consider all dimensions of your graduate program at CMSU and respond to each one.

Describe the greatest strengths of the overall program.

- A few good instructors.
- Managed coursework, practical projects.
- I feel I learned a great deal about testing especially IQ testing-very thorough class.
- That I have a wonderful job due to having a master's degree.
- When I went through the program in the mid-90's the greatest strengths were the Individual and Group testing classes taught by Dr. Smith
- Individualized attention provided by small class sizes.
- Warmth of instructors
- The instructors are good/offering of classes were good/you are prepared book-wise to be a good counselor.
- What I learned from outstanding educators at CMSU such as Pete Beard, Diane Albright. They packed so much information in an organized way, and were very understanding and available.
- Great instructors who take time to know their students. Great effort is made to turn out quality counselors with a variety of skills.
- Instructors were very helpful. Great job with the ethical aspects of counseling. The practicums were great-definitely keep them-it really showed you the job.
- Assessment and testing classes were of great benefit as most counselors are told they have to test in school districts. Dr Walter did an excellent job of teaching us how to top resources in order to help students develop in the "real world."
- Personal assessment and the effect on students. Very strong 1 on 1 counseling techniques and strategies.
- Staff and curriculum
- Obtaining high quality educators that coordinated and raised the overall continuity and quality of the program.
- Professors were wonderful, most classes were extremely beneficial
- Dr. Smith's Intelligence Testing Class is a big asset to the program.
- Psychology and the theory of Psychology. Information on therapists and their developments.
- The addition of faculty and new facilities.
- I felt pretty well prepared when I began my 1st job as a counselor.
- I really felt I was adequately prepared to deal with the ethical standards and laws dealing with school counseling.
- Hands-on practice required.
- Advisors are very supportive
- I graduated with the knowledge and experience I needed to "counsel." My Group Process and Practicum classes were superb'. Lots of work though!
- Ability to relate to instructors.
- Dr. Ferris is the consistent strength in your program! I would not have made it without her advisement.
- Support of faculty and students continues even after graduation.
- Dr. Albright and Dr. Middlemiss-who are both gone.
- The courses I needed were offered frequently enough that I never had to wait until a class was offered, thereby expediting my degree process.
- Attempts to cover as many areas as possible but does not address scheduling which most counselors must do!

- The greatest strength was in the teachers who shared theory, factual knowledge and experience in the field.
- The program and the numbers of the teaching staff do a good job of preparing students-systematically developing a strong theoretical foundation and emphasizing the ethical responsibilities. The course offerings focus on areas where practical applications can be made.
- Early on, the faculty (Dr. Albright, Dr. O'Malley) modeled excellent counseling techniques. Also the flexibility provided in allowing me to work and get my degree.
- Dr. Walters! Dr. _____ The instructors who cared about people and realized they had lives outside of school!
- The faculty is very knowledgeable and provides a very organized program.
- Practicum
- Individual Counseling Techniques
- Practicum experiences, caring of instructors
- It is thorough
- The program was designed to cover all aspects of a comprehensive guidance program. It did this for the most part.
- You are individualized, however concerns are/were rarely acknowledge.
- Experienced faculty
- Theories classes are stressed
- The incredible knowledge, professionalism and helpfulness of Dr. Cowles, Dr. Sesser, and Dr. Ferris. Their variety of instruction kept things interesting.
- New up-to-date faculty. Play therapy. Dr. Smith!!! A lot of things have changed for the better since Dr. Farris arrived!
- A teacher is able to complete the MS program in evening and during summers.

Describe the greatest weaknesses of the overall program.

- Lack technology and practical applications.
- During my time at CMSU there was a lot of turnover of staff-the consistency was not there.
- Ideological ideas need to be up-to-date on what counselors are expected to do in the schools.
- That there wasn't <u>any</u> direction given to the students as they went through the program.
- There was very little use of technology/computers during my program. It would have also been helpful to have had more instruction on individual and group counseling techniques before the practicums.
- Staff turnover & program changes. With new people coming in all of the time (while I was there) it was somewhat difficult.
- Too much theory-not enough real-life how-to.
- Parking/too much emphasis on clinical psychology/too much is expected during the Practicum/not enough of a varied schedule-classes weren't offered enough
- Changes were not held in a professional manner. Professors during application block did not follow through with feedback.
- No one ever came to observe my Practicum. Disorganization towards the end of my program. It was very difficult for me to follow Dr. ? as an instructor or an advisor. She confused me many times. (unorganized)
- Greater understanding needed of mental health issues in the population. More time allowed for learning techniques for particular groups i.e. early childhood, middle school, high school.

- Not geared toward technology. Didn't go through day-to-day aspects of counseling needed more on career and college counseling.

- Not a lot of emphasis placed on classroom counseling but on individual therapeutic counseling. I found the instructor leaned on cognitive therapy rather than behavioral (which is the main counseling technique used in school(s). Too much emphasis was placed on therapeutic cognitive counseling, which most students visit mental health care professions if their problem is that difficult leaving it illegal for us to counsel them in these areas.
- 1. Never same "the box"-no idea of how to set up a counseling program from sections- 2. No hint that 7-12 counselors are "paper pushers."
- Technology
- Inadequate funding to provide for additional quality instructors, enabling the addition of course offerings.
- Classes (especially psych. Classes) overlapped a great deal, reduce the hours for counseling degree.
- With the exception of Dr. Smith's class the classes seem to lack practicality. (related more to private practice than school counseling) i.e. issues-read but never discuss how to deal with students and these issues.
- "Reality" and what counseling is really like-especially at the Jr. High & H.S. & vocational levels. I received very little practical knowledge (i.e. "know how" on scheduling, how to use the curriculum and organizational skills, how to manage lost time due to so many meetings and conferences, travel time etc. more practical things and too much theory and unrealistic ideas).
- The great change the program was going through at the time I was there created confusion and uncertainty.
- Not enough technology emphasis. The program was in process of many changes when I was there and it became confusing.
- Counseling program needs more ways to deal with counseling with in a school. Counselors need to learn how to deal with staff members, parenting etc. all of the theories really aren't used on a day to day basis.
- Length of counseling program, but it would be difficult to make it shorter.
- 1. The school counseling practicum class just accommodates educators in a school setting that are hired as counselors before graduation otherwise it is next to impossible to meet the requirement. 2. Practicum class requires too much video taping, which leads too many issues.
- When I left CMSU, I was not prepared for helping students with their career goals and development-The professor I had for Career Ed. went straight from the book-nothing was "hands on."
- More technology use as relates to counseling. More legal information.
- There is an overturn of faculty members that demand one set of requirements, then a new faculty will be hired and they will require something else.
- The Practicum class needs to be completely redeveloped. CMSU needs a counseling center to provide the opportunity to practice those skills. Not to tape record or video tape your own set up sessions.
- Preliminary –Com DS Practicum I & II requirements. Does not relate to real work situations.
- It would be helpful to have more instructors so there would be greater exposure to varieties of experiences and theoretical orientations. Instead there are basically 3 instructors and students have them for several classes each.

- Students should possess GRE before being admitted into the program, not in the middle of the program or at the end. Eliminate preliminary test.
- I was off campus at the time, research using library periodicals was a huge problem for me. Now the internet and computer availability may take care of this.
- The greatest weakness is the lack of staffing to offer more concentrated classes (Practicum) in group work/facilitating, marriage and family, and play therapy.
- Later faculty members and the unrealistic and sometimes unreasonable "hoops" that were added making the degree program more difficult but not more practical or helpful in the field.
- Changing advisors last semester was not good, or changing Practicum Adm. Between 1st and 2nd practicums-who were totally different in techniques. Stats. Class (sad face)
- The comprehensive exam is out of date and not valid or reliable.
- Diversity Training
- Too many hoops to jump through
- Advanced mental health I thought would touch base on many different mental illnesses. It was a lot of article reading.
- Too long
- Being required to memorize "lists" of things for exams, when in practice one would look this up, not pull it from memory.
- In the middle of the program there was change in dept. heads. It was difficult for accepting the change. (True HS Counseling, I felt was not prepared for the demands).
- Too lengthy (48 hour degree)
- Availability-labs and clients for commuter students would have been nice. Is there a local agency in Warrensburg with whom students could work?
- When I began the program they needed more systematic procedures for applying, interviewing, explaining requirements, explaining the sequence of classes, etc. This may be better now since Dr. Ferris has now settled in.
- Dr. ? and Dr. ? …Counselors being trained without teaching experience.
- Not all students are treated the same by Dr. ? She favors some and gives others a hard time.

Describe some specific action(s) that you think the Program should take to improve Graduate Degree programs. (E.g., Additional course offerings, changes in present course offerings, etc.)

- More choice of classes, less testing
- Weed out unnecessary classes, maybe combine a few-the length of the program can be prohibitive
- Some professors expressed that if you are working on your master's in counseling you should not be working full time. Be realistic with your students. Expect from your students what you would expect from yourself.
- I think much has already been done to make improvements since I completed the program. In talking with others, going through the counseling program, the changes seem beneficial.
- Offer course both semesters (fall and spring) so that people can start their program at any time and so they can take the courses they need before they take preliminary and comprehensive exams.
- With the current standards, no one will want to enter the counseling field when they can obtain another master's degree in 10-15 hours.

- Keep quality instructors. Have course objectives outlined simply and followed. Have Practicum supervisors make 3-4 visits. Offer course in multi-cultural and/or family relationships.
- Revision of the Advanced Mental Health course. Some type of course for counseling special needs students e.g. bd. More play therapy courses.
- Should add some type of course on Counseling in the School. The students would learn about day to day responsibilities of a school counselor. Maybe do some observations and interviews.
- More courses added that actually teach what we can do in the school setting (regardless of what the college thinks "we should or shouldn't have to do). Less courses on how the college feels this is the "imagined" way of doing counseling. Make courses fit the real school-counseling world.
- 1. Infusing the practice of the counseling experience into more of the course offerings. 2. Continuing the present trend of offering additional courses. 3. Offering the choice of elective courses within the degree/certification structure.
- Advanced Mental Health must be re-vamped, it was the only class that I truly felt was a waste of time.
- Changes in present course offerings or revamp courses to contain practical information and experience when working in a school and not private practice.
- Take out Ed. Psych. from Counseling, we have enough from our BS (Degree)! Leave in Theory and add some Ed. Psych. to it if necessary!
- Additional quality faculty-fewer hours required to complete the program.
- More staff so greater individual monitoring, instruction etc. can take place.
- Courses that would further our programs to LPC, etc. we really need a counseling class early on that utilizes practicing counselors in a school setting to really know what a typical counselor's day is.
- New courses, however, they have been added since I received my degree.
- At this time, the school-counseling program is adequate.
- More projects and hands on experiences in the classroom, rather than lectures and memorizing for tests.
- Continue to add courses for those who've completed Master's degree in Counseling and would like to add to our knowledge. Advertise to alumni about these courses (mailings).
- One course should be dedicated to record and paper work required for a school counselor. The career course should be "geared" for school counselors instead of clinical. I received nothing practical for use in a school.
- Add crisis counseling to the class list! Cut down on the paperwork.
- Advanced Mental Health could certainly be a course with a vast amount of relevant information instead of doing nothing except reading articles. I could have done that entire class at home on my own. I thought it was a waste of money.
- Preliminary Test-Group testing should have included actual administering ITBS.
- Faster dependable processing of certification paperwork to be sent to DESE. Has been a frustrating process for on several occasions. Dr. Keisker has been personable and concerned, but I have had to constantly…
- The number of hours required discourage us when Principals and other fields in education could receive their degree and higher pays in less time. I believe we should have the extra 6 classes for this degree within the program for both certifications.
- In the ideal world there would be adequate funding to add two additional staff members so that the course offerings could be expanded. Courses specifically designed to work on group facilitation would be useful.

- More flexibility, more practical hands-on learning experience, more modeling of counseling "techniques" by faculty.
- More info. on the role of a counselor in the Special Ed. Programs. Also a more realistic role of the counselor in a school setting instead of the ideal! Diversity training.
- Could combine Orientation and Foundations. Require a family counseling class.
- Some of the changes since I graduated have already been implemented. Taking away Diagnosis of Reading, adding play therapy. Maybe less hours, 48 hours is a lot for a program.
- Remove certain courses and replace them with a few courses more clinical in nature.
- Adv. Mental Health-was a joke, should have included problems of suicide, medication, mental health problems of students. Computer work-I had no idea how to help students with college applications, scholarships etc…Practicum should cover this?
- Mandatory class in cultural diversity, Mandatory class in Family Counseling, Keep the requirement for intelligence testing but reduce # of transcripts sessions required.
- Offering all courses necessary to obtain LPC status. Course in cultural diversity. More testing courses. Offer more weekend classes.
- More instruction the psychological problems we are seeing in today's children.
- More specific courses leading to LPC license.

This letter was sent to each Graduate's Employer, Principal, or Supervisor.

February 2000

Dear Employer,

On behalf of the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University, I ask your assistance in the assessment instrument that I would like you to complete. Please return the survey to me in the prepaid envelope by March 1, 2000.

This task is in compliance with The State of Missouri (Excellence in Education Act of 1985), The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), our national accreditation agency for teacher education (NCATE), and our regional accreditation agency, (North Central). We need to conduct a follow-up of employers of **our graduate students who completed an MSE, MS, or EDS in one of our programs**. These data will be used in conjunction for the purpose of program improvement.

I will also be contacting your employee to make him/her aware of our surveys and ask him/her to participate. All responses will be confidential. If you wish a copy of our results, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope, and I will send you a copy as soon as they are compiled.

Sincerely,

Dr. John R. Zelazek, Chair
Teacher Education Assessment Committee

Follow-up Survey by Employers/Principals of School Counselors

Of the 79 Employer/Principals contacted, 47 (59% Return) completed the survey.

All statements are related to DESE/MoSTEP standards. Please rate your perception of your counselor's level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

4.5 The school counselor knows and understands human development and personality and how these domains affect learners, and applies this knowledge in his or her work with learners.

4.3 The counselor knows and understands the principles of measurement and assessment, for both individual and group approaches, and applies these in working with learners.

4.5 The counselor understands career development and planning processes across the life span, and assists all learners in their career exploration, decision-making and planning.

4.5 The counselor knows, understands, and uses classroom guidance methods and techniques.

4.5 The counselor knows, understands, and uses planning and goal setting for the personal, educational, and career development of the learner.

4.5 The counselor knows, understands and uses various methods for delivering responsive counseling services to learners in the school community

4.4 The counselor knows, understands and uses various methods to develop and maintain a comprehensive guidance program that serves the needs of all learners.

4.5 The counselor understands, develops, and uses professional relationships in the school, family and community, through consultation and collaboration, to promote the development of all learners.

4.7 The counselor knows, understands and practices in accord with the ethical principles of the school counseling profession.

4.7 The counselor knows, understands and adheres to the legal aspects of the role of the school counselor.

4.5 The counselor knows, understands and implements methods to promote their professional development and wellbeing.

4.4 The counselor knows and understands how human diversity affects learning and development within the context of a global society and a diverse community of families and who uses this understanding to assist learners, parents, and colleagues in developing opportunities for learning.

4.3 The counselor knows, understands and uses technology as a management and counseling tool in promoting the personal, educational, social, and career development of the learner.

Follow-up Survey of Graduate Students (Library/Media Specialists)

Of the 44 Library/Media Graduates contacted, 21 (48% Return) completed the survey.

MS—21

School year degree was completed, 1997—4, 1998—6, and 1999—7.

Program Evaluation---Please respond to the statements listed below. If you do not have enough information to respond to a specific statement, leave it blank. Please use the following Key for each statement:

KEY 4 = Strongly Agree 3 = Agree 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree 0 = NA

The following statements are related to graduate instruction and your coursework at CMSU:

3.8 The graduate courses you completed helped you to become more competent as a professional educator or develop competencies that could lead to other professional roles (e.g., school library media specialist, school psychologist, principal, etc.).

3.6 The courses you took built upon and extended prior knowledge and experiences.

3.7 Through your graduate courses you developed the skills to use research and research methods.

3.4 Your coursework helped you to increase your knowledge and understanding about issues and trends to improve practice in schools and classrooms.

3.8 The instruction in your graduate courses reflected knowledge derived from research and professional practice.

3.2 Graduate faculty used a variety of instructional strategies that reflected an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.

3.4 Instruction in your graduate courses encouraged the development of reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving.

3.1 Graduate level instruction reflected knowledge about and experiences with cultural diversity and exceptionalities.

3.7 In your graduate level courses technology was integrated into instruction.

The following statements are related to internships, or field-based activities, within your graduate program at CMSU (if your graduate program did not require an internship or practicum, skip this section):

3.3 Internships, or field-based activities, were well planned and sequenced, and were beneficial.

3.4 Internships, or field-based activities, related principles and theories to actual practice in classrooms and schools.

3.1 Internships, or field-based activities, created meaningful learning experiences within a variety of communities, with students of different ages and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations.

2.9 Internships, or field-based activities, encouraged reflection by candidates and included feedback from higher education faculty, school faculty, and peers.

The following statements are related to admission into and completion of your CMSU graduate program:

3.3 The criteria for admission to the graduate school and your specific program ensured quality candidates.

2.4 Incentives and affirmative procedures helped attract you to CMSU's graduate school.

3.0 In your opinion, the graduate student body was culturally diverse.

3.1 Your academic progress was systematically monitored with appropriate academic and professional advisement.

3.1 Your academic progress was monitored through systematic procedures and timelines.

3.3 The application of your knowledge gained through your graduate courses was assessed.

3.1 During your graduate experience at CMSU you were provided clear information about institutional policies and requirements needed for completing your degree.

3.3 A clear set of exit criteria/outcomes for completion of the degree was provided.

The following statements are related to the graduate faculty who teach courses at CMSU:

3.6 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about current practice related to the use of computers and technology.

3.3 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about and had experience with cultural differences and exceptionalities.

3.8 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were competent in research methodology.

3.8 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were knowledgeable about your selected subject/discipline.

3.8 The graduate faculty member who served as your graduate advisor was competent and knowledgeable of the graduate program.

The following statements are related to American Association of School Librarians (AASL) Position Statement on the School Library Media Supervisor.

Key 5 = very strong 4=strong 3=adequate 2= not strong 1= very weak

4.4 CMSU's graduate program prepares school librarians to administer the school library media program based on a plan of action that is based on the district's mission statement, goals and objectives.

4.5 CMSU's graduate program prepares school librarians to promote the library media program with faculty, staff and students.

3.7 CMSU's graduate program prepares school librarians to provide staff development in the use of instructional resources and technology innovations for school district personnel.

4.2 CMSU's graduate program prepares school librarians to serve as member of curriculum development teams, and as a planner and implementer of the K-12 instructional program.

4.2 CMSU's graduate program prepares school librarians to direction to the school in implementing the objectives of the school library media program.

The following statements are related to all graduate programs at CMSU. Please consider all dimensions of your graduate program at CMSU and respond to each one.

Describe the greatest <u>strengths</u> of the overall program.

- The instructors were former teaches and/or administrators, librarians, too and they conveyed their real world knowledge to us. I feel I was thoroughly prepared by CMSU to become a school librarian-a much better program than MU.
- Knowledgeable personnel-Dr. Helmick
- Professors & set-up of course schedule
- The professors cared deeply about students.
- Former faculty member—Aileen Helmick—She was the greatest! We did projects that actually pertained to what we would do on the job!
- Good foundation given to help when doing internship. Internship was great!
- Thorough instruction in research methodology
- Professors worked hard to meet students' needs! People in grad. office were wonderful to work with.
- The faculty and their depth of experience in the field.
- Knowledgeable and professional staff who offer balance of academic and real life school settings for students. Nice/helpful balance of course offerings.
- At the time I attended, I believe it was the instructors.
- The fact that CMSU offers a library program at all is itself a huge strength. Also, the relevancy of the classes is a plus. I've drawn from my library science classes several times to help me in the "real world".
- Specific curriculum for school librarians, use/application of technology.
- Dr. Helmick was the greatest strength as she had incredible knowledge and high expectations. The focus on school libraries was what brought me to CMSU!
- The courses-every class gave me something to use. The program is sound and applicable.
- Strong foundation principles.
- Feeling of camaraderie among students in small classes & groups, practicum experience, weekend classes.

Describe the greatest weaknesses of the overall program.

- Some advisors hard to reach-made you feel it was a burden (on them) to answer your questions.
- More instruction is needed on integrating library skills into the curriculum.
- Classes weren't always able to be offered in the semester they were needed.
- Lack of affiliation with ALA.
- As is the case with nearly any college level department, the instructor's detachment from the field is a minus.
- Practicum should be longer and more extensive. 40 hours is not nearly enough. Children's Literature should still be a requirement. "Library Materials for Children and Youth" course is not adequate at all as a substitute for a regular Children's Lit. Course!
- Need more technology classes (may already be offering more by now)
- Because I attended summers only, it was difficult to work in classes I needed. It was, however, projected when classes would be offered.
- None.
- Several projects, papers were not practical to courses offered.
- Lack of focus for urban educators, too much distance from the "front lines."
- On writing my thesis, lack of knowledge of APA forms and qualifications had me re-doing my thesis after submitting it to the Dean of grad. school. (Dr. Helmick retired before I finished.)
- Practicum
- Needed more instruction that was more "hands on" in the field. (more internship time)
- The retirement of Dr. Helmick
- Outdated information in selection of materials class—Dr. ?

Describe some specific action(s) that you think the Department should take to improve Graduate Degree programs. (E.g., Additional course offerings, changes in present course offerings, etc.)

- More research classes, perhaps-The thesis was the toughest part of my program. The research class I had helped me write the first section. I'd like to see a class that helps you write the body and finish the thesis. I guess I'm suggesting a Research Methods I & II scenario.
- Encourage student involvement in professional organizations.
- More technology on cataloging courses. More use of Alexandra, Follett, etc.
- Would be nice to have a course cover-"what you'll wish you'd learned"-it'd include how to repair books, the best companies (in terms of serving needs of school librarians) to work with, time management all of the things that a new person can get bogged down with daily. We get the philosophy & basic knowledge—but when in the trenches, having a seminar with current LMS's would be awesome.
- Basic, Intro. courses such as Intro. To librarianship and cataloging should be offered more often.
- I understand some classes are now being offered in the KC area. That is a wonderful option to attract more Northland people to the program.
- Establish course work to meet ALA certification.
- Despite the apparent contradiction of the two statements above, I do feel that the program could be upgraded by giving Dr. Lawson and Dr. Dorrell more opportunities to observe and work with real media specialists. It does help that they often bring in practicing media specialists to teach certain sections of classes.

- The department could attempt, if possible, to offer more classes in the Kansas City area. The demand certainly is there.
- 1. Require a full semester Children's Lit course. 2. Make Practicum longer and more like student teaching. (Some teachers have no library experience and will receive little help in some of their jobs) 3. Better hands-on technology training with all students in a lab setting using the same computers and same software. Grad assistants or computer science students could be lab helpers. We were lost in some of the computer courses. There was little consistency in the training and no outside assistance.
- Require technology-related courses earlier in the degree program. Increase number of technology classes required offer additional curriculum integration courses. Offer more seminars, weekend classes, etc. for professional development after MS.
- More training on multicultural resources in libraries, more training in administration (budgeting, meeting state standards) and public relations/promoting the school library media program. Much more emphasis on professionalism.
- Practicum needs to be re-evaluated especially for those already administering a school library program.
- I think the program has already improved since I graduated.
- More production experience-video overhead & more.
- As a library media specialist in a small, rural school I have become the "tech coordinator" by default! I think this is a common occurrence. Perhaps more technology courses would have been helpful!

Follow-up Survey by Employers/Supervisors of Library/Media Specialists

Of the 28 Employer/Supervisors contacted, 20 (71% Return) completed the survey.

All statements are related to the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) Position Statement on the School Library Media Supervisor. Please rate your perceptions of your school library media supervisor's level of competence for each of the following areas using the Key below.

Key---5 = very strong, , 4 = strong, 3 = adequate, 2 = not strong, 1 = very weak.

4.3 Your School Library Media Supervisor administers the school library media program based on a plan of action that is based on the district's mission statement, goals and objectives.

4.2 Your School Library Media Supervisor promotes the library media program with faculty, staff and students.

4.2 Your School Library Media Supervisor provides staff development in the use of instructional resources and technology innovations for school district personnel.

4.2 Your School Library Media Supervisor serves as member of curriculum development teams, and as a planner and implementer of the K-12 instructional program.

4.4 Your School Library Media Supervisor gives direction to the school in implementing the objectives of the school library media program.

Follow-up Survey of Graduate Students (Special Education Teachers)

Of the 124 Teacher Special Education Graduates contacted, 52 (42% Return) completed the survey.

MSE-50, Ed.S.-1

School year degree was completed, 1996-13, 1997-10, 1998-9, and 1999-9.

Program Evaluation---Please respond to the statements listed below. If you do not have enough information to respond to a specific statement, leave it blank. Please use the following Key for the first set of statements:

KEY 4 = Strongly Agree 3 = Agree 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree 0 = NA

The following statements are related to graduate instruction and your coursework at CMSU:

3.3 The graduate courses you completed helped you to become more competent as a professional educator or develop competencies that could lead to other professional roles (e.g., school library media specialist, school psychologist, principal, etc.).

3.3 The courses you took built upon and extended prior knowledge and experiences.

3.3 Through your graduate courses you developed the skills to use research and research methods.

3.2 Your coursework helped you to increase your knowledge and understanding about issues and trends to improve practice in schools and classrooms.

3.2 The instruction in your graduate courses reflected knowledge derived from research and professional practice.

3.1 Graduate faculty used a variety of instructional strategies that reflected an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.

3.2 Instruction in your graduate courses encouraged the development of reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving.

3.1 Graduate level instruction reflected knowledge about and experiences with cultural diversity and exceptionalities.

2.8 In your graduate level courses technology was integrated into instruction.

The following statements are related to internships, or field-based activities, within your graduate program at CMSU (if your graduate program did not require an internship or practicum, skip this section):

3.1 Internships, or field-based activities, were well planned and sequenced, and were beneficial.

3.1 Internships, or field-based activities, related principles and theories to actual practice in classrooms and schools.

3.1 Internships, or field-based activities, created meaningful learning experiences within a variety of communities, with students of different ages and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations.

3.0 Internships, or field-based activities, encouraged reflection by candidates and included feedback from higher education faculty, school faculty, and peers.

The following statements are related to admission into and completion of your CMSU graduate program:

3.0 The criteria for admission to the graduate school and your specific program ensured quality candidates.

2.5 Incentives and affirmative procedures helped attract you to CMSU's graduate school.

2.9 In your opinion, the graduate student body was culturally diverse.

3.0 Your academic progress was systematically monitored with appropriate academic and professional advisement.

3.0 Your academic progress was monitored through systematic procedures and timelines.

3.1 The application of your knowledge gained through your graduate courses, was assessed.

3.0 During your graduate experience at CMSU you were provided clear information about institutional policies and requirements needed for completing your degree.

3.0 A clear set of exit criteria/outcomes for completion of the degree was provided.

The following statements are related to the graduate faculty who teach courses at CMSU:

3.0 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about current practice related to the use of computers and technology.

3.2 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about and had experience with cultural differences and exceptionalities

3.2 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were competent in research methodology.

3.3 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were knowledgeable about your selected subject/discipline.

3.4 The graduate faculty member who served as your graduate advisor was competent and knowledgeable of the graduate program.

The following are related to DESE/MoSTEP standards. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

3.9 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.6 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.7 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.1 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's, district's, and state's performance standards.

4.5 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.5 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.3 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.4 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.3 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.5 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

The following statements are related to all graduate programs at CMSU. Please consider all dimensions of your graduate program at CMSU and respond to each one:

Describe the <u>greatest</u> strengths of the overall program.

- Classes are offered at a variety of locations. This provides many opportunities for people to attend classes.
- Good research class with Dr. Williams, Dr. Snyder was very knowledgeable in Elem. Curriculum.
- Faculty are very knowledgeable and make themselves available to students.
- Dr. Williams research class was very rigorous and beneficial. Dr. Koehler's instruction on the L.D. child was excellent. Dr. Warren's school law class was extremely beneficial. The strength was the exemplary professors.
- Flexibility of classes in locations and times offered.
- Very easy, admittance was a simple procedure.
- Research
- Caring, involved professors. (Especially Dr. Koehler)

- The amount of research required very easy to extend theory into practice good combo of building on any UG training and learning, plus lots of opportunities to learn new information as well.
- New staff members in Sp. Ed. department. Good variety of class offered on weekends and evenings.
- Off campus sites, Weekend classes
- The greatest strength of the program was the support I received from my advisor Dr. Swaggart.
- The greatest strengths of the overall program are collaborative learning groups within a class with hands on projects used for assessment.
- Actual coursework was mostly appropriate and relative.
- Location
- The personal application of graduate level courses and internship to my teaching/student needs. This made the program more beneficial to my students and colleagues as well as more meaningful to me.
- Accessibility, affordability, flexibility of scheduling at alternative sites. Knowledge base of B.D. curriculum instructors. Willingness of extended campus staff to work with students.
- Knowledgeable, caring faculty
- Most of the faculty
- Instructors were personable and willing to help. Support staff very helpful, i.e. secretaries/graduate help with student needs and as information resources.
- The greatest strengths would be knowledgeable professors.
- Variety of extended campus classes and summer options. Brenda Swaggart-Great Advisor!
- A large diversity of classes.
- Faculty-caring/knowledgeable/flexible
- Great professors
- My case was atypical, as I had been out a few years and time had expired to finish my master's, but CMSU staff extended courtesy and grace to me and I was allowed to complete my degree without losing credits.
- Advanced child psych. class-Middlemiss. Good variety in instructors. Class size. Instructors did a good job for the most part.
- Professors were outstanding! Requirements of courses were clearly stated. Versatile exposure to many experiences that could be encountered.
- Many of my courses were taught by people who were currently working the filed of special education.
- A very competent faculty. Relevant course work. Exceptional thesis advisors.
- Willingness of instructors to meet the time constraints or lack there of the students knowledge level of the instructors.
- Knowledgeable staff
- Instructors were very well educated and able to teach classes well.
- There were excellent teachers in a few classes.
- Teacher support
- Course offerings were, for the most part, meaningful & helpful
- There are numerous people who work with students of all ages to help them be successful. This overshadows those teachers who don't really care!
- Any of the classes that provide useful practical application offered the greatest benefits. Learning, discussing with other professional classmates were most useful as well.

- Class availability close to KC. Profs that were familiar with up to date information. Assignments that relate to current teaching practices.
- When I received both of my degrees at CMSU the greatest strengths were the supportive faculty and small class sizes that allowed for student interaction.
- I obtained a lot of hands on activities to utilize with students as well as in the field experiences.
- Most information I learned I could apply in my classroom.
- Can't cover breadth of responsibilities faced by administrators.
- 1. Instructors are concerned about student progress. 2. Instructors were generally objective-driven; that is they were clear about course objectives, covered these objectives & then assessed these objectives. The one exception to this rule was an assessment by a large project. Students were to accumulate a large number of products in a 3-ring binder for the lion's share of the points possible in the course. The instructor then made appointments with students to go over the project together. The instructor chatted with me for 15 minutes, barely looked at my project, and the interview was over. I left with the project, as did everyone else. The only feedback I got for the entire class was on tests. (scores only-no comments) I can't imagine that using "assessments" which are never reviewed is considered a desirable behavior or practice for instructors.
- The professors were knowledgeable and experienced.
- I had a wonderful advisor and the overall staff was terrific. They were knowledgeable and very supportive throughout my program.

Describe the greatest <u>weakness</u> of the overall program.

- I think any class offered at other sites should also be offered on the CMSU Campus. I've had to drive to Kansas City to take classes that weren't on campus. This caused difficulty as I have 3 small children.
- Lacked advisement, several instructors had been out of the "classroom" for too long and had not kept up to date-therefore assignments were not practical/appropriate for today's classroom teacher.
- Some classes such as, Research, had too much information and could be divided into 2 more comprehensive courses.
- I don't feel as knowledgeable in understanding and interpreting tests. Perhaps this just comes with experience.
- Advisor
- Many of the classes that were required for my degree were taught by the same professor, whom I felt was incompetent to teach on certain subject matters. She had not been in the classroom for 10-15 years. Many of the practices and situations of special education change over just 2 years.
- Too many professors are too far removed from the public school environment. Too much theory-lacking practical/realistic approach. More Sp. Ed. offerings to reg. ed principal candidates.
- Very Easy no thesis
- Loss of contact with the "real world." Too many of the professors have never actually taught to children representing the group that they are teaching about.
- I think the GRE should be required, with a minimum score to gain entry to the program, which would help debunk the myth that anyone can get into grad. school in Sp. Ed.
- Lack of teaching styles used in instruction

- Several faculty members who were not flexible with grad students who had full time jobs and families, One in particular gave me reason to change emphasis away from my desired area.
- The weakness that sticks in my mind is the professors in the Sped. Dept. They didn't seem to be in touch with the changing environment of Sped.
- The greatest weakness of the overall program is lengthy lectures without experiences shared within group.
- Advisors who do not care about their students and make no effort to listen and work with them in the best interests of all students.
- Observations to be completed; alternative assignments should be given to those who are in the field.
- I think you all offer education-it is up to students to make the most of your help and support through all the course work available.
- Instructors don't do an adequate job preparing prospective teachers for realistically dealing with behavior problems and students who refuse to work.
- Instructors appeared to be well versed in "research" but not always able to speak to the actual practices being utilized in public schools currently.
- Methods of research and writing about the results.
- Little use of technology by faculty.
- Not a lot of stability in the program. Older professors clashing with younger ones and assignments caused for a lack, sometimes, of quality instruction.
- Projects/Research assigned that are not usable in the classroom.
- Horrible follow through of paperwork. 3 times paperwork of mine was "delayed" once it left my advisor's office. The 3rd time it affected my Dec. '99 graduation. Due to someone's incompetence, I was not enrolled in fall internship so I am now delayed graduation until May. This will affect my rate of pay for the next 8 months, which may in turn affect my retirement in the future.
- Lack of communication between advisor and student. The advisor had too large of a caseload.
- Not enough weekend courses offered &/or classes @ Blue Springs location.
- A lot of confusion and disorganization with my advisor.
- Out dated material (Sp. Ed.) I knew more of the updated information that some instructors.
- Lack of technology instruction. Would like to have more/better methods instruction. Some availability in classes. More child development.
- Unclear of requirements of the 3 hrs. internship hour to enroll for 3 hours when catalog has it as a 1 hour class.
- I feel that if I had been able to do more during my internship I may have known more walking in.
- I don't see any.
- Not enough focus on all exceptionalities
- I had two different advisors. Neither one "caught" the mistake that 3 courses were not scheduled into my program. After I graduated I had to take the three classes to get certified. Class availability
- Quality of instruction in the SPED dept. was not always as good as I felt it should be. The addition of Dr. Swaggart will enhance learning, however, for undergraduate and graduate students.
- The tremendous gap between Reg. Educ. Courses and those expected of Spec. Ed. Reg. Ed. teachers need so many of those important classes. (i.e., Beh. Management)

- Not enough practical application. One particular prof. Responsible for many classes seems to hurt the program reputation. As she teaches how to teach she does not use good teaching techniques.
- I could not find weaknesses with the overall program.
- Can't cover breadth of responsibilities faced by administrators.
- Any program related to the field of education should have a component involving working with parents and the community. One of the biggest problems I find with career educators is their insularity and inability to take the perspective of those outside the education field. Individuals outside the school system could be contributors and guest speakers for teaching this component. Administrators who work successfully with the community could contribute also.
- It was difficult to plan my internship while teaching full time.
- The key should have been printed at the top of this page. (HA!) Actually, there were some teachers that changed their scheduled classes and final dates. I believe that everyone should be allowed to do this or that no one should be allowed to do this. There was some confusion in this area.

Describe some specific action(s) that you think the Department should take to improve Graduate Degree programs. (e.g., Additional course offerings, changes in present offerings, etc.)

- Graduate instructors should be given the flexibility and resources to return to the classroom and see what Teachers are facing today.
- Additional course offerings. Offer courses more frequently-fall, spring, and summer.
- I'd really like to see an all CMSU PHD program.
- More classes on Weekend College or Internet offerings would be helpful for more schedules.
- Profs should have public school experience and should be expected to renew that periodically.
- Have instructors that have been in the field recently. That knows what kind of students are in the schools and teaches effective strategies to future educators.
- More "hands-on" learning. Too much of the coursework is theory and so vastly removed from the classroom, that you enter that classroom unprepared for the behaviors etc. that you will encounter. Teach more law and paperwork for spec. ed.
- More course offerings at the graduate level only. A lot of the classes that were UG/G courses I had taken at the UG level. Also the course EpSp 5700 should be offered more frequently than every 2 yrs. I felt like I missed out on some important info by having to substitute a class that was nowhere near similar in content.
- I would encourage professors to be required to spend a certain # of hours in the sp.ed. classroom in various settings throughout the metropolitan Kansas City area to experience how different districts and educators assist the child with special needs (primarily the ECSE classroom).
- If a class is expected to be on the graduate plan-make every effort to find an instructor within 3 years. I had to finish at UMKC because of one class.
- Student teaching should be like an internship. In other words, a student teacher should be trained as a para educator… paid for services.
- Continue to use (Student (Graduate Student)) professional needs as key for internship responsibilities. It just means more when we can apply it to our classrooms or professional growth.
- Offer courses more frequently (every semester, rather than every other)

- Some of the education instructors would have contact, observation etc. time in public schools in the Metro area on a regular basis.
- Stay current about changes in education. Address these in classes; make behavior management a requirement for all teacher education programs.
- More simulated and actual hands on training for the job.
- Hopefully, there is a stabilization of staff and a progressive philosophy that parallels current national objectives.
- Make sure material presented is as up-to-date as possible.
- Require professors to return to "real" classrooms every 5 years. Too many are to "big-in-the-head" about their degree. I have no desire to learn about my professor's private life, drinking habits, grandchildren…on daily basis.
- The department needs to stay current on the current issues in society and provide information and activities that specifically relate to those issues (i.e. behavior management, cultural diversity, current standardized testing, and changes in IDEA.)
- A more varied summer schedule of classes during the daytime. More extended and weekend class offerings.
- Adding more updated material for those students that currently are teaching in the field.
- More technology. Instructors should be required to stay up-to-date with actual classrooms and students-maybe they need to do field-based activities?
- After the program of studies was set-I randomly took classes. I would have liked advisement on the order in which to take the classes.
- Give some specific requirements for intern supervisors. My intern supervisor wouldn't let me do many of the suggestions that were given. I felt like the only thing I did during my internship was read and type diagnostic summaries.
- NONE-not a weakness… However I would suggest two additional 2-hour courses 1. IEP and the Principal 2. Basic SPSS Stat Class
- More courses in school law, courses in listening and collaboration Special Education majors need a better understanding of group assessment instruments. Reg. Education majors need to know more about diverse learning styles. **I am now in administration-the candidates from CMSU appear more knowledgeable and better prepared for the classroom.
- Courses dealing with teaching blind/deaf/multihandicapped. Courses on adapting core subjects to persons with severe/profound disabilities. More courses on testing/evaluating students.
- Competent advisors. More classes that deal with working with student's discipline.
- More financial management. More work in the area of technology.
- 1. Offer more graduate courses during the summer. 2. Have more of a variety of classes to choose from. 3. Have Professors who really teach and want students to learn.
- More practical course offerings instead of so much book learning. Many of the books I purchased were expensive and a waste of time. Active learning is very weak. More courses available; closer to KC
- A course designed to help special educators know how to work effectively in a class within a class setting.
- Require school finance in Spec. Ed. Admin
- Some classes (for example, related to personnel administration) need to be taught by an instructor with abundant practical experience, who can connect theory and practice for students.
- I believe that when a course is offered, a student should be required to do the same work to complete the course and earn the credit, regardless of whom the instructor is. Some teachers required more work for the same credit.

Follow-up Survey by Principals/Employers of Special Education Teachers

Of the 114 Principals/Employers contacted, 86 (78% Return) completed the survey.

All statements are related to DESE/MoSTEP standards. Please rate your perception of your teacher's level of competence for each of the following areas on the line provided next to each statement:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

4.3 The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for their students.

4.3 The teacher understands how students learn and develop, and provides learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of their students.

4.1 The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to their diverse learners.

4.0 The teacher recognizes the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develops, implements, and evaluates curriculum based upon their student's, the district's, and the state's performance standards.

4.1 The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage they student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.1 The teachers uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.2 The teacher models effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.1 The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of their learners.

4.0 The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of their students.

4.1 The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Follow-up Survey of Graduate Students (Speech Pathologist/Audiologist)

Of the 159 Speech Pathology/Audiology Graduates contacted, 54 (34% Return) completed the survey.

MS—54

School year degree was completed, 1996—16, 1997—10, 1998—15, and 1999--13

Program Evaluation---Please respond to the statements listed below. If you do not have enough information to respond to a specific statement, leave it blank. Please use the following Key for first set of statements:

KEY 4 = Strongly Agree 3 = Agree 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree 0 = NA

The following statements are related to graduate instruction and your coursework at CMSU:

3.2 The graduate courses you completed helped you to become more competent as a professional educator or develop competencies that could lead to other professional roles (e.g., school library media specialist, school psychologist, principal, etc.).

3.3 The courses you took built upon and extended prior knowledge and experiences.

3.0 Through your graduate courses you developed the skills to use research and research methods.

3.0 Your coursework helped you to increase your knowledge and understanding about issues and trends to improve practice in schools and classrooms.

3.3 The instruction in your graduate courses reflected knowledge derived from research and professional practice.

3.2 Graduate faculty used a variety of instructional strategies that reflected an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.

3.3 Instruction in your graduate courses encouraged the development of reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving.

3.2 Graduate level instruction reflected knowledge about and experiences with cultural diversity and exceptionalities.

3.4 In your graduate level courses technology was integrated into instruction.

The following statements are related to internships, or field-based activities, within your graduate program at CMSU (if your graduate program did not require an internship or practicum, skip this section):

3.6 Internships, or field-based activities, were well planned and sequenced, and were beneficial.

3.4 Internships, or field-based activities, related principles and theories to actual practice in classrooms and schools.

3.5 Internships, or field-based activities, created meaningful learning experiences within a variety of communities, with students of different ages and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations.

3.4 Internships, or field-based activities, encouraged reflection by candidates and included feedback from higher education faculty, school faculty, and peers.

The following statements are related to admission into and completion of your CMSU graduate program:

3.3 The criteria for admission to the graduate school and your specific program ensured quality candidates.

2.9 Incentives and affirmative procedures helped attract you to CMSU's graduate school.

2.7 In your opinion, the graduate student body was culturally diverse.

3.2 Your academic progress was systematically monitored with appropriate academic and professional advisement.

3.3 Your academic progress was monitored through systematic procedures and timelines.

3.3 The application of your knowledge gained through your graduate courses was assessed.

3.3 During your graduate experience at CMSU you were provided clear information about institutional policies and requirements needed for completing your degree.

3.3 A clear set of exit criteria/outcomes for completion of the degree was provided.

The following statements are related to the graduate faculty who teach courses at CMSU:

3.2 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about current practice related to the use of computers and technology.

3.3 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about and had experience with cultural differences and exceptionalities.

3.5 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were competent in research methodology.

3.6 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were knowledgeable about your selected subject/discipline.

3.6 The graduate faculty member who served as your graduate advisor was competent and knowledgeable of the graduate program.

The following statements are related to American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA) Standards for Speech Pathologists/Audiologists.

If you were starting again, would you apply for admission to this program? If not, why not?

- Thirty-seven individuals answered yes without any explanation.

- Yes, because there is a variety of opportunities provided. Through CMSU's program. The clinical aspect is very important and monitored very closely.
- Yes-Regarding the undergraduate program. I very much appreciated the clinical experience at that level.
- Yes-I attended a larger undergraduate university but CMSU had a much better program, with faculty who cared about the students and knew their names-did not treat us as numbers.
- Yes-I would. I love my field-I wished I would have declared earlier as an undergrad.
- Maybe, the health care field is changing rapidly and not for the best in a lot of circumstances.
- No-Right now I wouldn't. I enjoy working in the schools and actually am working toward 2nd Masters in reading. I feel as though the graduate program in speech was solely for adult therapy-which I'm not doing nor do I plan to at this time.
- Yes-It is a well-rounded program that provided me with varying field experiences.
- Yes. I feel that the faculty members were always providing beneficial information.
- Yes-I would reapply since I wanted to work in the education environment of speech/language pathology. I advise people who are not interested in working in education to apply to other universities with a medical emphasis in speech/language pathology.
- Yes. Definitely and probably as well as graduate and undergraduate coursework.
- Yes and No. I like the "small town" feel of Warrensburg and the "family" atmosphere of the CMSU clinic. However, I seriously question the competence of the Director and certain professors. Some lack of actual experience in the field
- Yes-Easiest to get in MO.
- Yes, I enjoyed my graduate school experience and feel CMSU has an outstanding program in SP&A.
- Yes-Range of professional opportunities/environments

Which academic/clinical areas do you feel most prepared for?

- I feel I was most prepared for working in the long-term care situation. I don't think there were as many classes offered, but the internships really prepared me.
- Elementary Principal
- Artic treatment/articulation/Speech assessment—I didn't feel as comfortable in language…I'm more comfortable now after 3 years of working.
- Educational setting specializing in early childhood special education clinical hospital setting, pediatrics.
- Children and school-aged language and speech disorders.
- I felt most prepared for the technology utilized in Audiology.
- Speech-Language services in the schools
- Assessment of Speech & Language, Report Writing, Speaking with the parents and other professionals regarding a child's speech and language skills

- More prepared for the school setting than medical setting-lacking emphasis on TX for stroke patients for medical setting.
- Therapy with both adults and children whether in school or rehab.
- I am most prepared to provide articulation and language therapy to elementary students. I am least prepared to provide fluency or voice therapy and to work with middle school and high school students.
- Probably the medical setting because most of the graduate courses focused on this area. I felt a bit underprepared for the school setting, but felt very prepared to perform diagnostics due to an intense but worthwhile experience on Dr. Wilson's diagnostic teams. Schools and kids
- Treatment of language & articulation in the schools
- I felt prepared in all areas of speech-language pathology, but I did feel that I needed extended guidance to become comfortable.
- I feel I was most prepared for Early Intervention, Early Childhood Special Education. I feel my knowledge was adequate upon graduation for Adult & the Elementary age population. I do not feel I was prepared at all for High School age clients within the schools.
- Articulation/phonological disorders therapy
- Language and Articulation disorders
- Assessment of Articulation disorders, Treatments of articulation disorders, Assessment of language disorders
- Elementary & pre-K school settings
- Providing treatment, administering assessments
- Early childhood language disorders, treatment for adults with language disorders (aphasia/TBI) I feel more prepared for treatment and least with evaluation
- Clinical practice
- I felt most prepared for working with children
- School based language/articulation intervention
- I felt equally qualified to work in all clinical areas. I enjoyed my time at the public school the most, so I chose that area, but I felt prepared for any others.
- Articulation and Language
- Rehabilitation
- Schools, skilled nursing facilities articulation language
- Children's speech disorders
- Both schools, hospitals, nursing homes
- Speech and language of children in grades in K-12
- Speech Pathology
- Treatment of articulation and mild to moderate language disorders. I also feel good about Diagnostic work with 2-6 year olds because of CMSU's "Diagnostic Team."
- Language and articulation disorders in children.
- Working with children
- Therapy techniques for articulation and fluency
- Speech/language pathology preschool or elementary/middle school age. I am or feel I am not prepared as well for adolescents or adults speech/language problems. I feel I am well prepared for the legal and administrative aspect of speech/language path. in the schools.
- Articulation clients, voice language.
- Dr. Wilson's courses-Language Disorders and Articulation. The geriatric population-I had a great clinical experience in the hospital, thanks to great supervisors.

- Pediatric Population Developmental Delay Artic/lang. problems.
- I don't. We did not learn enough to function as good audiologists. I learned way more on my internship.
- ALL. Every aspect of the field was presented in hand on clinical format. Some how it was integrated in to the program.
- School based therapy for lang./artic. for the child without an additional diagnosis.
- Assessment & TX planning.
- Diagnostics. Artic & language therapy in school setting.
- Working in the school system
- Basic diagnostic audiometry
- I feel prepared to work in these areas: schools, rehabilitation sites and hospitals.
- Currently comfortable working in schools, hospitals and nursing homes. Upon graduation felt most comfortable in schools. Overall the graduate and undergraduate programs focused more on the school setting. Due to the fact that that was my comfort zone, I felt the need to pursue my uncomfortable environments to become stronger in those areas.

Generally, do you believe that most of what you learned was relevant to clinical work? If not, what could be done to improve the curriculum so that it is more relevant?

- Twenty-four individuals answered Yes without any explanation.

- I feel their needs to be a lot of changes to the curriculum. I think a lot of the graduate courses could be offered at the undergraduate level. I also find student teaching should be a part of the knowledge base you have at the current time of student teaching. I also feel there needs to be more preparation regarding DESE standards and expectations-Gear the program equally to going into education.
- Somewhat…So many opportunities arose to talk about clinic work, but very seldom did! It seemed like swallowing aphasia, neurology, dysfluency class talked very little about how to treat it. Aural rehab. Had nothing to do with working with children who were hearing impaired. This is what I would have liked to learn.
- Yet There needs to be more than one teacher (De Jonge) supporting the learning load of the graduate audiology students. I was happy to hear a new teacher will be coming in. It can only bring good things to the department.
- Need more education on treatment of adult clients and neurological disorders.
- Yes-Educators need to share more personal experience stories-great way to learn plus it deals with the real world.
- Could offer everyone more diagnostic experience.
- Yes-The dysphagia class was one of the classes that was very practical & very much reflected what is encountered in the medical setting. The courses focusing on school based clinicians could be improved by familiarizing students more with IDEA & IEP's. Also focusing on the "language" aspect of our profession as it relates to academics, (i.e. the SLP's role in pre-reading skills, written language skills.)
- No-A lot of it doesn't make sense until you're in that situation. I believe some role playing of "real" patients (not classic textbook varieties-for they are few and far between) would be beneficial to troubleshoot and discuss. I feel that the curriculum focused on school jobs primarily and not everyone wants to work in the schools.
- No-I think there should be more of a focus on therapy techniques. I feel there was too much emphasis on theories, assessment, etc.

- Yes-I felt very unqualified when I student taught. My Student Teacher "Supervisor" felt I should have been more familiar with the Special Education process and paperwork, which I was totally unprepared to complete.
- Sometimes-Some classes needed more opportunity for hands on clinical experience (Neurogenic, Voice, Dysphagia, & Aphasia). It would have been nice to at least have a video series in these classes to bring the lecture to "life."
- Yes-However, some courses spent the majority of instructional time on assessment and factors related to the disorder. I would have liked more info. on practical suggestions for treatment.
- I feel that in the work force the SLP's are more up to date with current trends and tx approaches. CMSU faculty should be required to at least observe outside of the university to stay current.
- However, not enough actual practicum experience with dysphagia, especially competence in video swallow studies.
- Some what
- No-I think more observations in a variety of clinical settings would have helped. More guest speakers would have been beneficial. Also, a survey sent out to current SLP's in the field that would have helped develop more relevant information to teach. For example, a significant amount of time was spent on diagnostics and not treatment. In reality a lot of time is not allowed in clinical settings to evaluate, more time focuses on treatment.
- Yes-More "hands on " direct clinical hours of adults with various disorders.
- No-I think we spent too much time on learning various theories. Our time would have been better spent on treatment techniques.
- Yes & No-I don't feel I learned enough about therapy for fluency clients to feel comfortable now that I have fluency clients.
- Yes-Classes need to reflect on disorders, diagnosis, treatment/therapy goals. Often classes would spend too much time studying history & beginning stages.
- Yes-The only area in my field of Speech Pathology I was not prepared for was the paperwork. I spend 80% of my time doing paperwork. It was a real surprise. I had no idea that much paperwork was involved or how to do it. Very relevant
- Yes. However, I feel that transfer (Graduate) students should have to have a full semester in the school setting instead of just 50 Clinical Clock hours. To learn more about Spec. Ed. procedures, IEP's, Goad Writing, etc. I ended up in a school setting and wasn't completely prepared!
- No. I feel like I received an adequate knowledge base (book knowledge) but no functional strategies to use with my students. The curriculum should include less research (which is mostly impractical) and more therapy ideas. Especially, for more difficult disorders i.e. voice and fluency. Also, the public school experience needs to be more organized and beneficial. I took away very little from my Public School experience and I learned nothing about all the paperwork! I was completely unprepared.
- Yes. Clinic had access to a lot more materials/equipment than is available in the "real" world. I never have what I need for eval. or TX..
- No. Because speech/language therapy can include many areas (voice, fluency, swallowing, etc.) a guided path focusing on a specific area (school setting, home health, hospital, etc.) would be helpful. I felt I knew a little about a lot of areas, but not a lot about the area of interest.
- No. We need to learn more than just Phonak, and we need to learn more about circuits.
- Yes. I never felt more prepared for my clinical practicums.

Given the opportunity what should you have deleted from the graduate program?

- Nine individuals answered Nothing or None without explanation.

- Speech Science Aural Rehabilitation for SLP's. If you need to use equipment you are taught on the job. The likelihood of remembered how to use all of that equipment is slim. SLP's are not allowed to do anything with hearing with audiologists being too abundant. The paperwork
- Cleft palate…already deleted. Aural rehab. Focus more on working with children who are hearing impaired.
- Dr. ? I don't mean to be rude, but I could have taught all of her classes with organization, more information and more professionalism.
- Less focus on research classes and more on actual field work.
- Less time in the classroom (Lecture Setting) More time applying knowledge gaining experience.
- I have high praise for graduate work in speech pathology. I have used/relied on all areas presented in graduate work.
- Audiology and research-although both were important for the basics.
- I would have liked the aural rehab class to have more of a focus on how to handle the speech and language issues of the deaf/hard of hearing. Perhaps have ½ the class taught by an audiologist and ½ by an SLP.
- I would eliminate the exhaustive repetition of examining tests for children in language and articulation. Some of these tests aren't even available anymore and I've found that institutions only have a select few tests to even use and you learn that test and give it repeatedly.
- The courses required in the education field. I did not learn anything that was relevant to my job as a school SLP.
- I believe a differentiation should be made in the clinical setting regarding clinical service criteria for TX and school based TX criteria and rehab criteria. With different clinical supervisors focusing on their "specialty" limited-giving students in all areas.
- I would <u>not</u> have deleted anything.
- Research class when a thesis isn't required.
- Nothing-we actually need more coursework.
- Nothing-would have added more.
- Industrial Audiology
- I would not have deleted anything.
- Research and Design.
- No classes were so unimportant that I felt they should be deleted. However, I would have liked to delete the parts of the classes that did not deal with actual diagnosis and treatment.
- I feel everything I was involved in is important to me either now in the schools or possibly later in rehab.
- Research Design
- Cleft pallet class should have been offered along with another area (i.e. cognition, etc.) instead of a course by itself since it's a low percentage of our caseloads.
- I would have shortened the course on "cleft palate."
- I feel that all of the courses and internship/externship experiences were important.
- All courses were beneficial to my current practice
- All of it has been utilized in my professional work.
- Research methods-I learned nothing practical in this course.

- Can't remember now.
- This is a challenging question because everything included in the dynamics of the program is so relevant.
- This question is easy to answer since I have made my choice to work in the school setting. If I were still attending grad classes, I'm sure I wanted to know everything since I had not made my choice.
- Cleft Palate Course
- Some of the theories & busy work (copying articles, etc.)
- Nothing, almost everything prepared me for the work force.

Given the opportunity, what would you have added to your graduate program?

- A class on Special Education Law & Paperwork. Most importantly slow down the program. Being required to take 12-15 hours a semester is ridiculous. You learn for short-term memory only. By the time you are at this level most people are married and starting families. The program needs to accommodate the students.
- More opportunities for discussion with practicing administrators.
- More "hands-on" instruction for some of the Graduate Courses such as Aspsia Rehab and Language Disorders.
- More autism. CAPD more language treatment.
- Great to have more detailed coursework in the areas of stroke, aural rehab.
- More emphasis on adult communication disorders and swallowing disorders.
- A class on E-Chog and other brainstem responses besides ABR would be good. A course really teaching ABR and EMG would also have been handy.
- Class to discuss IEP paperwork, rehab paperwork, billing, etc. Discussion of this needs to be more in depth.
- I would require all clinicians to attend the clinician's meetings and would like to have all students given the opportunity to provide voice and fluency therapy and to learn to use the equipment/technology which are effective in therapy rather than just techniques.
- More emphasis on doing a thesis vs. a special project-this would allow us to have the experience of completing research vs. the proposal that was required in research & design class. It may also give the clinicians in the field the background experience of research so more relevant practical research would be produced from active clinicians (i.e. regarding school issues).
- More hands on in nursing homes and hospitals with more classes for medical term and general procedures in nursing homes of hospitals.
- I would add more comprehensive education of computer programs in the start of voice disorders. Information on tracheotomy patients and how to deal with them more effectively.
- A course of specific therapy techniques for treating common articulation errors (i.e. /r/phoneme, /s/phoneme, etc.).
- Opportunity to Student Teach in more than one age level. A graduate class focusing on Schools/Special Education Process/IDEA/IEP's/Due Process etc.
- More classes/info. on dipphagia. This is 90% of my caseload, but we only had 1 (2) hours class on the subject. More hands on opportunities.
- A course dealing with assessment & treatment of communication disorders in infants/toddlers ages birth-3 years.
- More application instruction vs. theory. More exposure to the medical side vs. school side of speech therapy.

- Cleft Palate Course. At least 2 courses per subject area-I feel we needed more in depth instruction.
- More Practicum requirements, such as; 4 week assignments for a total of 3 different SHES & populations. (many schools have this option available to their students) More training in evaluation/diagnostics-actual hands on training rather than reading & giving presentations on the various testing materials.
- More practical hearing aid fitting info.
- I would have added a semester course in brain injury and cognition (adults and children). I would have also added a general information course on goal setting, resume writing, job hunting skills, etc.
- Observation hours or clinical hours of various patients in hospital settings-while doing the relevant coursework.
- I would have liked to actually visit a wider variety of clinical settings and observe more treatment techniques.
- Student teaching or required observation of all types of clients during graduate program and in addition to the one required at undergrad level. More information on special education process and state guidelines regarding qualifications into sped. program.
- More information in language treatment intervention for school age children.
- Yes-I think a basic sign language course would be beneficial and should be required.
- Sign language should be required as well as state of MO laws and paperwork related to school, Medicaid, Medicare, insurance…
- More research! The program did little to prepare me for a dissertation and preparation for a Ph.D. program/thesis and or publication. Also, more emphasis in cognitive treatment.
- A class devoted to Special Ed. paperwork.
- Assistive Technology/Augmentative Communication Course. I would have "improved" the course (graduate course) on Audiology and have it more related too clinical practice.
- Sign language as a required course, & maybe a course dealing with communication disorders within special populations. More hands on experience
- Language therapy techniques that could be used in the classrooms.
- A class or add within a language or speech class, more information on applying clinical work with adolescents or/& adults. I would have had added/switched the adult Practicum experience throughout the program and not at the end only.
- More info/coursework for the classroom setting in schools, dysphagia TX, fluency TX
- Cleft palate course Autism class I was able to rush through the program in a year and a half. At the time I thought this was great but since realized what a great disadvantage it was. A graduate speech pathology should not be less than a 2-year program.
- Experience/training elderly population. And special TX and related problems. Info on where to search for eval./TX materials.
- More multicultural information. More field work actual cases to diagnose.
- More focus on the LD, multihandicap, ADD, ADHD, BD, OD, etc. child. I feel more time could be given if other areas, which are not applicable to the school setting, were deleted. More school-related Practicum
- More on autism, specific disorders ADHD etc… specific therapy techniques
- More practical, "hands-on" application of treatment strategies.

- Classes in evoked potentials (longer than a few weeks in the summer) and otoacoustic emissions.
- Classes on cleft palate-or more in depth information.
- More hospital and health related courses to increase comfort level in those environments upon graduation.

4.1 (N=52) On the following scale (5 = High to 1= Low), please rate your overall satisfaction with the program.

Follow-up Survey by Employers/Principals of Speech Pathologists/Audiologists

Of the 93 Employers/Principals contacted, 42 (45% Return) completed the survey.

All statements are related to American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA) Standards for Speech Pathologists. Please rate your perception of your Speech Pathologist or Audiologist's level of competence for each of the following areas.

Which academic/clinical areas do you feel he/she is most prepared for?

- Articulations, fluency, language, voice
- Language development.
- Our students have had excellent training with backgound in dysphagia, neuro, TBI, adults and children's communications disorders, voice and fluency. They have had a good diverse educational opportunity.
- School age children/articulation, fluency, vocabulary and overall speech production (Preparation for adult work cannot be determined at this facility)
- Language Articulation
- Articulation sessions. Evaluation skills and documentation skills.
- Knows materials, methods, application and is able to complete IEP process/ paperwork very well.
- She is prepared well in all areas, Works well in both Speech & Language
- The therapist is prepared for all areas
- I do not feel qualified to rate a speech pathologist, so am just writing my perceptions. I am very happy with the program that has been carried out for our students. Our speech pathologist is knowledgeable of physical attributes that affect speech, the sequence of therapy to correct problems and how to work positively with students to achieve gains.
- Any-well prepared
- One-on-one work with students
- All areas of Speech Pathology-therapy, assessment, parent conferencing, handling students, paper work, scheduling, relationships with staff
- Articulation and language therapy
- Articulation
- Public school speech/language remediation
- Clinical assessment and therapy
- Language/Artic. Therapy for early childhood students
- Academic-Articulation and language development of the child. Types of disorders and causes of impairments. Research in appropriate ways to treat students with disabilities. Clinical-treatment strategies for articulation and mild-moderate language delays.
- Language development
- She appears to be competent and well prepared in all areas. She is extremely conscientious and concerned about children
- I feel that Mrs. Huhman is qualified in all the areas.
- Speech Pathology clinical work and clinical teaching.
- Having school and medical experience was very helpful.
- Area of speech pathology and language therapy.

- Clinical programming for treatment of basic communication/cognition deficits in a more pediatrically orientated client population. Knowledge in adult neuro. Evaluation is weak. As is knowledge of dysphagia evaluation and assessment/programming for more complex neurologic disease/injury.
- Language/children
- Prepared well for children & adults
- Barbara has no areas of deficiency. She was well prepared for all areas we use her for.
- Audiology
- Evaluation and treatment if children especially pre-school and grades K-8
- Evaluation/therapy for preschool and school age children
- Acute care & pre school/school age Randy was in 3 different settings for us-acute, extended care & school. I really was satisfied with his skills in all 3.
- Language

Generally, do you believe that most of what your Speech Pathologist/Audiologist has learned is relevant to their clinical work? If not, what could be done to improve the (CMSU) curriculum so that it is more relevant?

- Thirty-two individuals answered Yes without explanation.

- No-Some curriculum is so technical and not enough treatment information.
- Yes-They would have better preparation for multicategorical students if they had training and experience with behavioral management.
- I am not familiar with specifics of CMSU curriculum—However, given the Master's level requirement for SLP I would recommend that potential therapists be encouraged to pursue specialization in specific area or with specific age group during graduate level work. This may mean students entering graduate school with a degree in an unrelated field will need to extend graduate level studies to allow time for specialization in desired speech field.
- Yes Work with fluency and voice with assigned supervisor, vs. book only. Need practical experience, also; in these areas.
- I think what has been learned is a good knowledge base. It is necessary to know what the research is, behavior modification techniques etc. However, it would be very beneficial for the Education Department @ CMSU to work with the Comm. Disorders Dept. in the area of Assistive Tech & Augmentation Devices.
- Yes-very student centered
- Regulatory issues, Legislative issues, Ethical issues
- Yes-OAE training Hearing Aids
- Yes-Audiology
- No-Some curriculum is so technical and not enough treatment information.
- Yes Work with fluency and voice with assigned supervisor, vs. book only. Need practical experience. Also, in these areas.
- N0-More adult practica, more adult disroders and treatment plans.

Given the opportunity, what would you delete from our graduate program so that our graduates are better Speech Pathologists/Audiologists.

- Eight individuals answered Nothing, None or N/A without explanation.

- Emphasis in teaching in graduate program.

- I have not observed a position that I would delete. As a clinical supervisor I am not aware of the total curriculum.
- I do not have enough information on this subject.
- General Philosophy
- General Philosophy
- Not able to answer without more specifics about your program curriculum.
- I think the course on cleft palate is important, but I believe there should also be an option of an AssistiveTech/Augmentative communication class also.
- Wouldn't delete any program
- Heidi has been very well prepared for the school setting. She is a very professional, knowledgeable young clinician.
- I do not have all the information necessary to answer the question.
- The education requirements
- I would delete nothing but would add more education classes to better prepare graduates. Give more hands on experience.
- I am not knowledgeable regarding the specifics of your graduate program to reliably suggest what could be emulated.
- Not delete anything
- Less theory more application and TX protocols

Given the opportunity, what would you add to our graduate program so that our graduates are better Speech Pathologists/Audiologists.

- A cleft pallet course, more detailed information concerning special education guidelines and paperwork in schools.
- N/A
- Decrease fear of not being in compliance with Speech Pathologists "lawn" so that can be served more completely.
- More clinical experience-observe more schools and different programs (i.e. Special Learning Center or in school preschool program). Add sign language class to curriculum. Many ECSE programs use whole language approach.
- Nothing
- Augmentative communication, computer based voice programs/systems, feeding.
- I like the fulltime internship after all coursework has been completed. It allows the students to actually learn how to work in a clinical setting.
- Our pathologist is excellent
- Nothing. I had the opportunity to work with at least 3 graduates of CMSU and felt all were well trained.
- Integration of language assessment and goals with other disabilities, i.e. L.D. Teamwork required to complete an IEP when more than one disability is involved.
- Special Ed procedures. Write IEP
- Specific directions on how to fill out paperwork & conference with parent's permit to evaluations, procedural safeguards placement forms. How to schedule and manage time (for therapy, observations and assessment.)
- I feel that, again, an assistive technology and augmentative device class would be beneficial.
- More practical work
- I would say to have as much clinical experience as they can possibly get with all areas.

- Nothing
- More hands-on with clients
- Courses in education and hands on classes-field experience. Sit on IEP ratings.
- Increased exposure to wide variety of assessment tools for adults and pediatrics. Increased training in dysphagia, with exposure to FEES, bedside assessment, etc. Significant work on designing appropriate measurable long-and-short-term goals and increase
- Educ. In dysphagia, more in diagnostics report writing.
- Nothing-she could tell you.
- None
- Knowledge of autism, PDD and Asperger Syndrome. How to develop and implement successful methods and techniques for working with children having these communication disorders. Knowledge of how the sensory system affects therapy. More experience and knowledge or oral motor methods and techniques and Apraxic motor therapies to increase intelligibility and functional communication.
- She uses a tactile method in her lessons, which I feel is very effective.
- Increased experience with infants, toddlers(<3 yr.), feeding/oral motor issues, sensory processing impairments and meurology, positioning children/handling children with physical needs.
- Increased opportunities for evaluation and treatment of the adult population
- More SW allowing TX

4.3 (N=52) On the following scale (5 = High to 1= Low), please rate your overall satisfaction with the program.

Follow-up Survey-Graduate Students-Teachers-Curriculum and Instruction

Of the 217 Teachers (C/I) contacted, 118 (54% Return) completed the survey.

MSE—109 Ed.S.--4

Elementary—47, Secondary—38, K - 12—11, Reading—16, Adult Ed.—0

School year degree was completed, 1996—25, 1997—33, 1998—31, and 1999—27.

Program Evaluation---Please respond to the statements listed below. If you do not have enough information to respond to a specific statement, leave it blank. Please use the following Key for the first set of statements:

KEY 4 = Strongly Agree 3 = Agree 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree 0 = NA

The following statements are related to graduate instruction and your coursework at CMSU:

3.2 The graduate courses you completed helped you to become more competent as a professional educator or develop competencies that could lead to other professional roles (e.g., school library media specialist, school psychologist, principal, etc.).

3.3 The courses you took built upon and extended prior knowledge and experiences.

3.5 Through your graduate courses you developed the skills to use research and research methods.

3.2 Your coursework helped you to increase your knowledge and understanding about issues and trends to improve practice in schools and classrooms.

3.2 The instruction in your graduate courses reflected knowledge derived from research and professional practice.

3.1 Graduate faculty used a variety of instructional strategies that reflected an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.

3.2 Instruction in your graduate courses encouraged the development of reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving.

2.9 Graduate level instruction reflected knowledge about and experiences with cultural diversity and exceptionalities.

2.9 In your graduate level courses technology was integrated into instruction.

The following statements are related to internships, or field-based activities, within your graduate program at CMSU (if your graduate program did not require an internship or practicum, skip this section):

3.2 Internships, or field-based activities, were well planned and sequenced, and were beneficial.

3.3 Internships, or field-based activities, related principles and theories to actual practice in classrooms and schools.

3.1 Internships, or field-based activities, created meaningful learning experiences within a variety of communities, with students of different ages and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations.

3.2 Internships, or field-based activities, encouraged reflection by candidates and included feedback from higher education faculty, school faculty, and peers.

The following statements are related to admission into and completion of your CMSU graduate program:

3.1 The criteria for admission to the graduate school and your specific program ensured quality candidates.

2.5 Incentives and affirmative procedures helped attract you to CMSU's graduate school.

2.8 In your opinion, the graduate student body was culturally diverse.

2.8 Your academic progress was systematically monitored with appropriate academic and professional advisement.

3.0 Your academic progress was monitored through systematic procedures and timelines.

3.2 The application of your knowledge gained through your graduate courses, was assessed.

3.2 During your graduate experience at CMSU you were provided clear information about institutional policies and requirements needed for completing your degree.

3.3 A clear set of exit criteria/outcomes for completion of the degree was provided.

The following statements are related to the graduate faculty who teach courses at CMSU:

3.2 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about current practice related to the use of computers and technology.

3.1 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about and had experience with cultural differences and exceptionalities.

3.6 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were competent in research methodology.

3.4 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were knowledgeable about your selected subject/discipline.

3.4 The graduate faculty member who served as your graduate advisor was competent and knowledgeable of the graduate program.

The following statements are related to DESE/MoSTEP standards. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following statement.

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

4.1 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.4 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.4 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.4 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's, district's, and state's performance standards.

4.4 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.4 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.2 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.4 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.4 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.4 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

The following statements are related to all graduate programs at CMSU:

Please consider all dimensions of your graduate program at CMSU and respond to the following statements:

Describe the greatest <u>strengths</u> of the overall program.

- Dr. Karr was my greatest strength. She took time to listen and never made me feel rushed or unwanted. Her guidance was always useful.
- The diversity of courses offered. I felt challenged and enjoyed my graduate program at CMSU. Overall most courses taught by motivated, competent instructors.
- The updated courses that are geared for teaching in the 2000 schools. My best classes were the special offerings.
- Intro to research was helpful because I turned my proposal into a grant.
- Professors who cared about their student's futures.
- Keep up on new information.

- The inclusion of technology has really improved since the early 1990's
- It gives teachers new ideas about methods. Most comes from talking with other teachers.
- Flexible class times, locations. Group collaboration. Respect as a professional.
- Collaboration among students in class. Experience of instructors. Accessibility of advisors.
- Summer Practicum
- The professors, teachers who taught in the education department.
- More of your traditional teachers have been retiring and you have been hiring those that don't lecture all the time.
- Working with other teachers-Dr. Karr
- Some nice, intelligent teachers.
- School law, Technology Courses, Curriculum Courses, Research, and Graduate Office helped greatly when my Advisor dropped the ball.
- Throughout the entire time spent at CMSU, I have always felt the faculty to be a strength. They were dedicated, helpful, and easy to get along with in and outside of class.
- Weekend courses.
- The academic advisor, most required classes (Reading) the class discussions.
- Clarity of requirements, off campus class opportunities
- Weekend classes were a wonderful way to pick up hours over a short period of time.
- Reading department was a strength. Many courses required outside field were not beneficial.
- Availability of extended campus and weekend classes. I liked the way Comps were set-up. Allowing you to choose professors in your classes you fit were competently taught and the choice of comps or thesis is good for different styles learned.
- The program was very strong in philosophy, theory, and research. The Professors understood the expensive of being a Principal as they were principals.
- Research
- *Profs-allowance of students to choose courses for program completion.
- The opportunity to complete the degree with classes offered in Blue Springs was a lifesaver.
- Knowledgeable reading department faculty, personally professionally supportive, consistent, and open to new ideas, strategies & alternatives re: students and theories.
- Instruction topic varied, up to date and practical.
- Faculty
- Advanced technology and state requirement regard teaching are up to date. The graduate program instructors keep students in the know about education requirements of trends for state offices. Technology is incorporated in to the program varying ways.
- Research classes
- The extended campus was very helpful, instead of driving to CMSU. I also really thought that doing research enhanced many of my abilities.
- Most of the instructors were exceptional especially in the area of reading. All of the classes were relevant and the reading practicum provided evaluation, practices, and self-evaluation and taught the value of action research.

Describe the greatest weaknesses of the overall program.

- My academic advisor was the greatest weakness in my program. I never received any guidance from her. She was not one to listen. The one time I went in her solution to my problem was to quit my coaching position so I could take her course because it was only offered at that time. This is my job and she told me to quit or to bad.

- Moving instructors out of the classroom that may be teaching while waiting to retire. Classes taught by these instructors are a total waste of time and money!
- The greatest weakness in CMSU's overall program is the presents of busy work & excessive research. Many graduates are attempting to maintain a full time teaching job, manage a home and family, and go through the program at CMSU. Course work should be helpful not hindering.
- Some of the professors, who did not actually work for the university full time, were not as available and didn't seem to know exactly what to teach.
- Advisement
- A lot of repeat.
- Blanket degrees merely move one up the salary schedule. A degree in education should serve two purposes (at least) 1. Introduce the latest "practical" research for application, 2. Provide deeper conceptual development in content areas. CMSU's answer is "Write an interdisciplinary unit" SAD!
- I feel the instructors need to spend more time in the classroom. Some of their ideas would never work. They also have no idea about the change of the students and discipline problems.
- Way to much theory—I felt that many of the classes were similar to beginning theory classes as an undergraduate. Too much emphasis on learning the "process" of ideas needed more activities that could be taken directly into the classroom.
- Talked a lot about theories but we didn't get a chance to look at reading programs & comp. programs or market.
- Graduate students more opportunities to work on or create projects they can use in the classroom. Poor organization & teaching-Dr. ?.
- I didn't feel as though I was being helped as I picked classes toward my master's degree. I ended up taking two classes I did not need.
- Too many theory based classes which do not pertain to the "real" world of teaching.
- I was very disappointed with my experience at CMSU. I felt that it was poorly managed without a thought of people trying to get through it. Classes were cancelled at the last minute leaving people who are desperate to finish with a wasted semester (or 3 in my case) unable to finish their degree before tuition was raised again. The courses were boring and had no new ideas to enhance and extend what was taught in undergraduate. Communication between school and students off campus was also unacceptable. Not receiving a course catalog until after enrollment begins and classes being full are unacceptable. My own advisor, when trying to help me due to a class cancellation by enrolling me in her class, cancelled her class due to low enrollment! People were enrolled-they needed that class. I work with many teachers beginning Grad school-I cannot recommend your school.
- Very upset with lack of quality of teaching in Psych. of the exceptional child-Dr. ?. Advisor failed to turn in completed program to grad. office.
- In reference to numbers 17, 18, 20, and 21, the student body could use more guidance. Often time, requirements, general info. etc. was found out through casual conversation before class started. It is unrealistic to rely on busy advisors or the graduate catalog to supply all necessary information. This problem applies to undergraduates, as well. Perhaps professors could make regular announcements before class. This would help eliminate deadlines missed, clear up confusion and quite possibly reduce advisor appointments for the professors.
- Offer graduate classes in other communities
- When it came time to graduate there was some miscommunication between your office & the graduate office. Your office had cleared me for graduation but they had not. The grad. Office thought that I was short a class, but I wasn't. I didn't find any of this out

until the deadline date for graduation-& I only found out because I had called the Registrar's office looking for my final transcript.

- The bureaucracy-One person will tell you one thing-someone else will tell you something else. I didn't feel in control of my program. Dr. Carr did a good job, but Dr. ? was not approachable.
- Advisement program, most grads don't even know who their advisor is. The class that was broadcast over TV was terrible we had over 30 students in Blue Springs & yet the teacher was only in person twice. Broadcast from Warrensburg where there were 2 students enrolled.
- Hands on application of theory, research & philosophy. There was little preparation for real world experience. Need more hands on with evaluation.
- Cultural strategies on instruction
- Functional degree sought originally-Business Dept. faculty bullied me out-only Ed. profs. Convinced me to stay.
- Advisors not always readily available.
- Frustrating to graduate with MSE & still necessary to take more courses to fulfill state requirements. I would have rather gone longer-instead of false hope. Maybe college could correlate their guidelines with state.
- Did not use a big enough warning sign saying "Way too much paperwork, kids will become even more disrespectful, and there are always committees..."
- Inconsistency from one professor to another. Not all professors had the same expectations for students.
- I feel that offering some classes only during the school year as night classes is a weakness. Although, I enjoyed those classes, I did not appreciate the time taken away from class prep. and other professional development opportunities.

Describe some specific action(s) that you think the Department should take to improve Graduate Degree programs. (e.g., Additional course offerings, changes in present course offerings, etc.)

- Offer the classes several times throughout the year. As described above, I could never take my final class because it was only offered in the fall. This doesn't work for everyone.
- Grant writing at the Master's level needs to be expanded. There should also be a demand for MSE students to publish research performed in specific courses. MSE candidates should be expected to teach 1 class (day) in at least one undergrad class, as well as a brief mentorship of an undergrad.
- It is dad that I only took one ELED course. The bulk of my courses were in secondary math and science. I had to accept a degree in elementary curriculum and instruction. SAD!
- Don't assume that graduate student need to write papers in every class. Teachers do not write papers in their profession very often. Use more pratical methods.
- Technology-/Pschology & possibly counseling courses to help diffuse violence and provide understanding and guidance for children needing help.
- Offer more courses on how to teach using the new standards. More courses on managing troubled youngsters are needed as well. Less research and more hands-on activities that will improve the quality of teaching.
- I think specifically, that the education classes (grad. & undergrad) should focus more on giving future teachers hands-on activities that can be actually utilized in the classroom. Too many classes focus on theory, which is not helpful in the classroom. The only

undergrad classes that helped me in teaching were student teaching Dr. Mahalovich's and & Dr. Manzo's classes.

- Multicultural Instructors and Courses
- Additional time offerings of specific classes (core). Classes should deal more with practical (projects, assignments) that can be incorporated right into the classroom.
- Update info. Go into classrooms and observe practices.
- More weekend classes!
- Additional courses at different sites
- More weekend classes, shorter summer classes.
- One of my greatest disappointments was when a required grad. Class turned out to be a repeat of a required undergrad class. The same professor taught it under a different name. The same info. was even presented in the same way. I became frustrated when I learned nothing new and thought of the wasted money spent. Please monitor the courses offered.
- I think more hours for the graduate elective should count toward the total 32 hours. The EdCI 5000 courses were very beneficial.
- Elem. School Curriculum EdCI 5320 Supervision of Instruction in Reading EdCI 6240 these two courses that were too vague and abstract. The professors I had seemed confused by objectives.
- Additional course sections for those classes that fill up early (Research, School Law) etc. would be helpful.
- I am concerned about the new graduate programs just started that have lower standards, making all master degrees less valuable.
- New weekend classes and extended campus offerings. These help full-time teachers pick up classes in spare time.
- Courses preparing, the administrator in dealing with students, parents, policy, community with real life evaluation.
- How different countries learn! (Education/instruction of students) How different races learn!
- Add course offerings, more work in technology, more field-based activities.
- Keep offering the classes off-campus (in Blue Springs, etc.)
- More lab time than one summer. Hands on experience with theories presented.
- It has been a few years since I graduated, so my suggestion may have already been addressed. Since technology is changing everyday, required courses in technology would be beneficial. My students teach me about the computer everyday (which isn't so bad!)
- CMSU should invite exemplary teachers to share their ideas and best practices in a course guided by a CMSU professor.
- More course offerings in the summer. More evaluation of instructors by the university.
- Offer more weekend classes.

Follow-up Survey by Principals of Teachers Curriculum and Instruction

Of the 209 Principals contacted, 162 (78% Return) completed the survey.

All questions are related to DESE standards. Please rate your perception of your teacher's level of competence for each statement:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

4.3 The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for their students.

4.4 The teacher understands how students learn and develop, and provides learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of their students.

4.4 The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to their diverse learners.

4.2 The teacher recognizes the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develops, implements, and evaluates curriculum based upon their student's, the district's, and the state's performance standards.

4.2 The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage their student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.3 The teachers uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.3 The teacher models effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.3 The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of their learners.

4.2 The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of their students.

4.2 The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Follow-up Survey of Graduate Students (Reading Teachers K-12)

Of the 23 K-12 Reading Teacher Graduates contacted, 16 (69% Return) completed the survey.

MSE--16

School year degree was completed, 1996—3, 1997—3, 1998—6, and 1999--3

Program Evaluation---Please respond to the statements listed below. If you do not have enough information to respond to a specific statement, leave it blank. Please use the following Key for the first set of statements:

KEY 4 = Strongly Agree 3 = Agree 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree 0 = NA

The following statements are related to graduate instruction and your coursework at CMSU:

2.9 The graduate courses you completed helped you to become more competent as a professional educator or develop competencies that could lead to other professional roles (e.g., school library media specialist, school psychologist, principal, etc.).

3.2 The courses you took built upon and extended prior knowledge and experiences.

3.4 Through your graduate courses you developed the skills to use research and research methods.

3.1 Your coursework helped you to increase your knowledge and understanding about issues and trends to improve practice in schools and classrooms.

2.9 The instruction in your graduate courses reflected knowledge derived from research and professional practice.

2.9 Graduate faculty used a variety of instructional strategies that reflected an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.

3.1 Instruction in your graduate courses encouraged the development of reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving.

2.4 Graduate level instruction reflected knowledge about and experiences with cultural diversity and exceptionalities.

2.8 In your graduate level courses technology was integrated into instruction.

The following statements are related to internships, or field-based activities, within your graduate program at CMSU (if your graduate program did not require an internship or practicum, skip this section):

3.3 Internships, or field-based activities, were well planned and sequenced, and were beneficial.

3.3 Internships, or field-based activities, related principles and theories to actual practice in classrooms and schools.

3.4 Internships, or field-based activities, created meaningful learning experiences within a variety of communities, with students of different ages and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations.

3.4 Internships, or field-based activities, encouraged reflection by candidates and included feedback from higher education faculty, school faculty, and peers.

The following statements are related to admission into and completion of your CMSU graduate program:

3.2 The criteria for admission to the graduate school and your specific program ensured quality candidates.

2.2 Incentives and affirmative procedures helped attract you to CMSU's graduate school.

2.8 In your opinion, the graduate student body was culturally diverse.

2.4 Your academic progress was systematically monitored with appropriate academic and professional advisement.

2.4 Your academic progress was monitored through systematic procedures and timelines.

3.2 The application of your knowledge gained through your graduate courses, was assessed.

2.7 During your graduate experience at CMSU you were provided clear information about institutional policies and requirements needed for completing your degree.

2.7 A clear set of exit criteria/outcomes for completion of the degree was provided.

The following statements are related to the graduate faculty who teach courses at CMSU:

2.9 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about current practice related to the use of computers and technology.

2.8 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about and had experience with cultural differences and exceptionalities.

3.3 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were competent in research methodology.

2.9 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were knowledgeable about your selected subject/discipline.

2.9 The graduate faculty member who served as your graduate advisor was competent and knowledgeable of the graduate program.

The following statements are related to DESE/MoSTEP standards. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas on the line provided next to each statement:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

4.0 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.4 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

4.3 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.5 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's, district's, and state's performance standards.

4.6 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.4 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.5 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.3 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.6 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.6 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

The following statements are related to all graduate programs at CMSU. Please consider all dimensions of your graduate program at CMSU and respond to the following questions:

Describe the greatest <u>strengths</u> of the overall program.

- Dr. Karr was my greatest strength. She took time to listen and never made me feel rushed or unwanted. Her guidance was always useful.
- Friendliness, leadership.
- Summer Practicum. Working with other teachers-Dr. Karr
- The academic advisor, most required classes (Reading) the class discussions.
- Reading department was a strength. Many courses required outside field were not beneficial.
- Advanced technology and state requirement regard teaching are up to date. The graduate program instructors keep students in the know about education requirements of trends for state offices. Technology is incorporated in to the program varying ways.
- Most of the instructors were exceptional especially in the area of reading. All of the classes were relevant and the reading practicum provided evaluation, practices, and self-evaluation and taught the value of action research.

- The reading practicum was a great strength of the reading program. It provided many opportunities to put into practice, the things we were learning. The faculty in the reading program knew their areas well and presented many new and practical ideas to implement in the classroom.

Describe the greatest <u>weaknesses</u> of the overall program.

- My academic advisor was the greatest weakness in my program. I never received any guidance from her.
  She was not one to listen. The one time I went in her solution to my problem was to quit my coaching position so I could take her course because it was only offered at that time. This is my job and she told me to quit or too bad.
  A couple of courses were repetitive and taught by an out-of-date teacher. Dr. ?
- Some of the professors, who did not actually work for the university full time, were not as available and didn't seem to know exactly what to teach. Advisement
- Talked a lot about theories but we didn't get a chance to look at reading programs & comp. Programs.
- When it came time to graduate there was some miscommunication between your office & the graduate office. Your office had cleared me for graduation but they had not. The grad. Office thought that I was short a class, but I wasn't. I didn't find any of this out until the deadline date for graduation-& I only found out because I had called the Registrar's office looking for my final transcript.
- The bureaucracy-One person will tell you one thing-someone else will tell you something else. I didn't feel in control of my program. Dr. Carr did a good job, but Dr. ? was not approachable.
- Did not use a big enough warning sign saying "Way too much paperwork, kids will become even more disrespectful, and there are always committees..."
- I did not appreciate classes that relied heavily on presentations from the students (Dr. ?). I don't mind a certain amount of this because I like hearing what other people are doing in their districts; however, when paying the kind of money it takes to receive a master's degree, I would much rather be listening to the faculty who are being paid to teach us.

Describe some specific action(s) that you think the Department should take to improve Graduate Degree programs. (e.g., Additional course offerings, changes in present course offerings, etc.)

- Offer more courses on how to teach using the new standards. More courses on managing troubled youngsters are needed as well. Less research and more hands-on activities that will improve the quality of teaching.
- I think specifically, that the education classes (grad. & undergrad) should focus more on giving future teachers hands-on activities that can be actually utilized in the classroom. Too many classes focus on theory, which is not helpful in the classroom. The only undergrad classes that helped me in teaching were student teaching Dr. Mahalovich's and & Dr. Manzo's classes.
- One of my greatest disappointments was when a required grad. Class turned out to be a repeat of a required undergrad class. The same professor taught it under a different name. The same info. was even presented in the same way.
- I became frustrated when I learned nothing new and thought of the wasted money spent. Please monitor the courses offered.

- Elem. School Curriculum EdCI 5320 Supervision of Instruction in Reading EdCI 6240 these two courses that were too vague and abstract. The professors I had seemed confused by objectives.
- Consider taking action on the weakness I listed above. (Dr.?) Like I said before, a certain amount of sharing is OK but listening to lengthy presentations by students who are being required to present them is not what I was paying for.

Follow-up Survey by Principals of Reading Teachers K-12

Of the 20 Principals contacted, 15 (75% Return) completed the survey.

All questions are related to DESE/MoSTEP standards. Please rate your perception of your teacher's level of competence for each statement:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

4.1 The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for their students.

4.1 The teacher understands how students learn and develop, and provides learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of their students.

4.4 The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to their diverse learners.

4.6 The teacher recognizes the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develops, implements, and evaluates curriculum based upon their student's, the district's, and the state's performance standards.

4.6 The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage their student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

4.5 The teachers uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.4 The teacher models effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.5 The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of their learners.

4.6 The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of their students.

4.6 The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Follow-up Survey of Graduate Students Administration

Of the 129 Administration Graduates contacted, 106 (82% Return) completed the survey.

MSE—57 Ed.S.--48

Elementary—57 Secondary—47

School year degree was completed, 1996—16, 1997—17, 1998—29, and 1999—25.

Program Evaluation---Please respond to the statements listed below. If you do not have enough information to respond to a specific statement, leave it blank. Please use the following Key for the first set of statements:

KEY 4 = Strongly Agree 3 = Agree 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree 0 = NA

The following statements are related to graduate instruction and your coursework at CMSU:

3.4 The graduate courses you completed helped you to become more competent as a professional educator or develop competencies that could lead to other professional roles (e.g., school library media specialist, school psychologist, principal, etc.).

3.3 The courses you took built upon and extended prior knowledge and experiences.

3.3 Through your graduate courses you developed the skills to use research and research methods.

3.3 Your coursework helped you to increase your knowledge and understanding about issues and trends to improve practice in schools and classrooms.

3.2 The instruction in your graduate courses reflected knowledge derived from research and professional practice.

3.0 Graduate faculty used a variety of instructional strategies that reflected an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.

3.3 Instruction in your graduate courses encouraged the development of reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving.

2.9 Graduate level instruction reflected knowledge about and experiences with cultural diversity and exceptionalities.

2.4 In your graduate level courses technology was integrated into instruction.

The following statements are related to internships, or field-based activities, within your graduate program at CMSU (if your graduate program did not require an internship or practicum, skip this section):

3.0 Internships, or field-based activities, were well planned and sequenced, and were beneficial.

3.1 Internships, or field-based activities, related principles and theories to actual practice in classrooms and schools.

2.9 Internships, or field-based activities, created meaningful learning experiences within a variety of communities, with students of different ages and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations.

3.2 Internships, or field-based activities, encouraged reflection by candidates and included feedback from higher education faculty, school faculty, and peers.

The following statements are related to admission into and completion of your CMSU graduate program:

3.1 The criteria for admission to the graduate school and your specific program ensured quality candidates.

2.4 Incentives and affirmative procedures helped attract you to CMSU's graduate school.

2.7 In your opinion, the graduate student body was culturally diverse.

3.0 Your academic progress was systematically monitored with appropriate academic and professional advisement.

3.1 Your academic progress was monitored through systematic procedures and timelines.

3.2 The application of your knowledge gained through your graduate courses was assessed.

3.3 During your graduate experience at CMSU you were provided clear information about institutional policies and requirements needed for completing your degree.

3.4 A clear set of exit criteria/outcomes for completion of the degree was provided.

The following statements are related to the graduate faculty who teach courses at CMSU:

2.7 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about current practice related to the use of computers and technology.

3.0 The graduate faculty was knowledgeable about and had experience with cultural differences and exceptionalities.

3.5 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were competent in research methodology.

3.5 The graduate faculty members who served as thesis advisors were knowledgeable about your selected subject/discipline.

3.6 The graduate faculty member who served as your graduate advisor was competent and knowledgeable of the graduate program.

The following statements are related to National Policy Board of Education Administration (NPBEA) standards. Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following statements:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

4.2 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate professional and ethical leadership.

4.1 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of information management and evaluation.

4.1 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of curriculum, instruction, supervision, and the learning environment.

3.9 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of professional development and human resources.

3.8 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of student personnel services.

4.0 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of organizational management.

4.0 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of interpersonal relationships.

3.9 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of financial management and resources allocation.

3.2 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of technology and information systems.

3.7 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of community and media relations.

4.2 The institution's graduate program prepares school leaders who demonstrate an understanding of educational law, public policy and political systems.

3.7 (Answer only if applicable) Your internship, or field-based activity, provided a significant opportunity in the workplace to synthesize and apply knowledge, and to practice and develop your skills as an administrator.

The following statements are related to all graduate programs at CMSU. Please consider all dimensions of your graduate program at CMSU and respond to the following statements:

Describe the greatest strengths of the overall program.

- Experienced faculty-need to get back in classroom and teach-The students have changed!
- The courses taken through the EDAD department were for the most part very beneficial and I have sued many of the ideas in class in my job!
- A concerned and caring faculty is the greatest strength of the program. The instructors an active role in each student's program.

- Weekend courses, networking with other admin.
- Wonderful faculty supervision and personnel issues, law
- CMSU Atmosphere, course offerings/time frame/matrix available, certain instructors, i.e., school finance.
- The interaction between class members helped to prepare me greatly for assuming my job as a principal. Many discussed experiences, practices, and problems in their areas.
- The faculty in all my classes allowed the class to discuss trends/topics in education. Most used real life situations we had to react to the situations.
- Excellent Faculty. Relevant coursework.
- School law had some good instructors.
- Most courses provided practical, useful knowledge and competencies while being theoretically well grounded. The professors took personal interest in my progress. They offered wise counsel.
- School law, school finance & personnel!
- I really appreciated the opportunity to listen to and converse with practicing superintendents. Having completed my Master's at UMC I found CMSU to be much more practical rather than so research based.
- Overall, CMSU prepared me to do a good job on the Administrator's assessment. The course work was designed that way objectives were clear.
- Caring instructors that are knowledgeable in their field of study.
- The instructors and office personnel (are good people)
- Staff with recent experience in public school administration and practicality of course work.
- Open communication in the classroom.
- Internship experience
- General knowledge of the professors
- Experienced quality professors that challenge all students to strive for excellence.
- Some instructors are very personable.
- Master's program was good pretty much touched all bases-great instructors.
- Very well coordinated.
- Instructors were very knowledgeable & had real-life experiences they shared
- Faculty
- Quality instructors who have a working knowledge of school leadership practices.
- The individual attention shown by the instructors.
- Accessibility and flexibility of classes and scheduling.
- I feel being able to do half my coursework in BS was a plus. Dr. Snyder and Dr. Mihalovich's classes were the best. I felt I actually could use the info. they provided. Dr. Williams also provided this.
- Very workable. Faculty understood that most students were under contract/obligations. Student friendly-research based.
- The internships was excellent! Dr. Gordon Warren was an excellent teacher and a great benefit to my growth as an administrator.
- You had good instructors and department advisors-and heads of department that had good rapport and interest of student.
- Flexibility of course offerings and willingness of advisors and professors to work with students.
- Networking, STAFF at CMSU/Dr. Warren is awesome!
- The exceptional staff-Reynolds, Thomas, Bachus!

- Prep for ISLAC, investigating current issues and resolutions, actual organizations and responsibilities, varied base of knowledge in all management area.
- A sincere care for our success, a suburban/rural focus, personal relationships with peers, sharing, leadership academic prep, CMSU personal touch "environment a family."
- Course content. Discussion of practices in the class. Faculty
- Very knowledgeable instructors
- In the past few years, instructors are using more authentic assessments, than previous.
- A caring faculty who took a personal interest in students. School finance class, personnel class.
- The faculty was very knowledgeable and flexible
- Scheduling was easy. Courses were offered at a variety of times. Friendly flexible teachers.
- Willingness of faculty to give of their time to explain some of the particulars of the program or meet with you at unscheduled or inopportune times.
- My advisor-Dr. Warren=A+ Practical application of material
- Supervision, Law, personnel, summer scheduling
- Networking with other professionals. Good law and finance classes.
- The instructors know quite a bit about the courses they teach.
- Immediately useable procedures and excellent networking from all administrative classes.
- Availability of course offerings.
- Instructors
- The teaching staff is always available to help and answer questions.
- I felt prepared to take the assessment.
- The personal relationships the one-on-one instruction time the ability of CMSU's school leaders to relate real life experiences in the classroom.
- Dr. Gordon Warren-it's a shame he can't teach more as the dean. He's an excellent faculty member.
- Practical information in most grad. courses. School-community-personnel-law classes most beneficial.
- Advisement, excellent, knowledgeable instructors
- School law-the internship, when I got to be the principal (practical experience)
- Research skill development
- Strengths include the opportunity to hear other new and experienced administrators address issues as well as having the expertise of the instructors.
- Faculty
- Dr. Zelazek and Dr. Wright challenge yet realistic in expectations. School law, School finance, School Admin, Buildings and Grounds and the law, Internship.
- School law and school finance were especially helpful because of Dr. Warren.
- Many of the instructors were excellent. Variety of courses was useful and beneficial.
- Ability to access faculty and work with other students in the field at that time.
- The faculty and their individual attention to each graduate student.
- Professional, knowledgeable teaching staff, helpful
- Many faculty members, (especially newer members) fresh from the field. Great deal of personal insight and practice.
- Internship in Administration
- Instructors
- Flexibility with weekend, evening & summer courses

- Faculty is a strength. Beneficial to be prepared for the profession by practiced administrators
- Dr. Warren/most of staff has lots of experience.
- Informative classes, good instructors with lots of experience
- Professors
- Finance, Curriculum--need to know how to oversee, match to standards, assess appropriateness—not how to do a global curriculum topic.
- Most of the professors had administrative backgrounds and could relate experiences to students. Many valuable contacts were made.
- The greatest strength is the approachability and knowledge of the instructors.
- Solid course curriculum
- Instructors who had recent field experience. The head of the department, Dr. Warren, is extremely well suited for his position. His work ethic and concern set him apart.
- The quality of students in grad programs.
- Topics that were in the news related to education were discussed in addition to past history. The educational scene changes daily.
- Easily provided available courses. Excellent student/faculty relationships.
- Dr. Bachus
- Instructors were knowledgeable in the subjects that they taught.
- Ability to apply information learned in a school setting. Opportunity to work with a group of diverse professionals

Describe the greatest weaknesses of the overall program.

- No coverage of the Extracurricular programs.
- Limited number of classes for Middle School, also the scheduling of the few available makes it very difficult to take classes in this area.
- Need more meat—increase expectations of students. Some instructors with low expectations just put in the time.
- Had some very poor instructors. Too many classes with "jump through the hoops" objectives.
- Need special education law information.
- The courses taken through the EDCI department were weak and instruction was poor.
- More legal preparation. Some instruction in computer informational system (i.e. SIS, LEMCO) would help!
- My internship was not at all authentic. Since elem. admin. Don't have the luxury of getting asst. positions we really need this exp. to offer more credibility to our resume.
- Technology applications instruction
- Courses within the Counseling Department were of minimal value and poorly taught.
- Again, overall, CMSU does not offer students much in cultural diversity issues or urban education problems. This is its greatest weakness.
- Classes just offered in fall, etc.
- I did not feel completely prepared to take ISSLIC. I feel that if I'd had more opportunity for "in-baskets" etc. then I would have felt more comfortable spending $435.00 2xs! Urge CMSU administration to assist potential administrators in preparing them for the ISSLIC.
- Providing info about technological services such as scheduling, grade reporting, etc.
- Need more instruction on Community Relations
- Technology

- A large enough program to make taking required courses more convenient isn't in place.
- Too repetitive in the information given
- Cannot get classes needed to complete degrees-more classes offered for specialist each semester.
- No integration of technology
- Technology
- I believe the program is outstanding in all areas.
- Redundancy. If you have the same professor for 2 classes at the same time, you often have the same class discussion for 2 separate classes.
- Advisors. It is hard for teachers to get to a phone. A letter or some follow through would be nice. I had to take a day off work to meet with her and left with no more than I had arrived with.
- Technology
- Curriculum development
- (Did not have) Need a course for aspiring educators-called slap in the face reality that goes beyond theory. Slap in face 101-new students Slap in face 303-new administrators-I might teach this for you?
- Sometimes a hassle to get books for right classes when commuting.
- Number of 6000 level courses are offered a year!!
- The lack of a portfolio project-I understand this is changing.
- Time in a management position
- The classes that were just facts (foundations) we had that in undergrad. The societal issues class that consisted of liberal details.
- Internship-it was only one semester and did not give practical experiences.
- Some 2-hour courses require more specific lengthy work than 3-hour courses. Mostly student taught.
- Little to no special ed. training. Sitting as a member of IEP team has been a learning experience. IEP & the Law would be a good addition.
- A lot of lecture-it would really help to have more contact with people in the field. The curriculum class needs to be more aligned with MO. requirements for curriculum-that's what we have to do! Supervision class needs to be better.
- Professors sometimes appear to be out of the loop-not on top of "real" school issues.
- Because the 2-semester internship was new, there were too many similarities in the 2 semesters.
- (F.Y.I Dr. ? was the poorest teacher I've ever had in 8 years of undergraduate and graduate work.) Great deal of repetition between the classes.
- Some instructors had a tendency to belittle or degrade students with derogatory comments if students disagreed with theory or philosophy being taught. Some used their position to intimidate or scold unnecessarily in front of classmates.
- Lack of technological element
- Instructing students on conflict resolution; preparing students for irrational parent behavior.
- If you have experience in the field, some classes do not provide any new info. (i.e. school and community relations, education in the social order.)
- Egocentric, demeaning professors giving little or no usable material and seemingly not focused on areas class should have covered.
- Distribution of information about state certification
- Needs to be more specific preparation for activities in the state assessment center.
- The MSE internship was not a good use of time.

- Dr. ? biases toward some students. I also did not feel there was enough practical application.
- Lack of technology-equipment. Additional levels of law/finance for Admin.
- Dr. ? teaches too many of the courses-and she teaches the same subject matter in each one.
- Certain curriculum courses were little more than summarizing research articles rather than a study of curriculum components, alignment to objectives, etc. Needed practical experience. This varied with the particular instructor teaching the course.
- Instructors who are too far removed from public schools and have forgotten what it is like to teach kids.
- Basic skills used by administrators-Discipline, personnel, development, etc.
- Instructors too busy with other projects to prepare for class-no more instruction than read the book and present it yourself.
- Internships
- Knowledge of instructors in the area of technology and use of a variety of instructional strategies.
- Several courses included the same exact material yet had different names.
- A few of the instructors had the effect of discouraging rather than encouraging pursuit of the profession. Students were much more technologically orientated than professors.
- Not enough people instructing who were up to date in the classroom/principalship currently!
- The technical aspect of the program was not strong as I went through.
- Need to have more contact with technology related to on the job experiences.
- Several of the courses addressed the same basic information. Lacked technology component.
- Facilities should be a required course.
- Lack of use of technology
- Only one professor teaching research with adequate knowledge of "how-to."
- Use of technology. Provide even more study of School Law with strong study in Special Ed. law.
- A few classes were a waste of time and money/Dr. ? -did not allow us to use computers in our finance class
- C&I classes tended to be weaker-poor instructional practices, unclear expectations (C&I)
- Coursework and Evaluations.
- Got the feeling some work was done in classes just for the sake of doing some work. (not much value)
- At time the instructors fail to incorporate technology into the instruction of courses.
- Library availability
- Dr.?
- Practicality to what is really happening in this job.
- More emphasis needed in the financial aspects of administration
- The class "school supervision" was horribly worthless. I had to bring toothpicks to hold my eyes open.
- Lack of sequence of courses-took classes in a manner that fit my schedule (fine) but people with whom I took classes changed through the program

Describe some specific action(s) that you think the Department should take to improve Graduate Degree programs. (E.g. Additional courses offerings, changes in present course offerings, etc.)

- Courses need to be offered more frequently if possible. Parking is a major drawback. I like the "adjunct" Professor/Instructor concept because it allows someone in the field to bring in first-hand experience.
- Admin. Candidates need an internship that prospective employers consider being credible to admin. Experience. It is very difficult to get beginning admin. Exp. at the elem. level. Without it employers won't hire you for that 1st job.
- Course assessments use more application guestions such as those found on the ISLCC Licensure test. Course offering for administrators pertaining to law, etc., for Special Services.
- Include technology applications course in all program requirements.
- Instructors need to be more realistic in current trends. Actually get out there. Time have changed.
- More case studies; Roleplay scenarios; Include personnel management on a practical level.
- Maybe a little more information on grant writing.
- Dr. Williams, Dr. Bachus and Dr. Warren were very helpful.
- Foundations is not necessary for anyone with an undergraduate education degree. A SPED class would be helpful to those without a SPED background so they can develop an understanding of legal issues. A practical curriculum class would benefit many, as they became curriculum leaders.
- There is a need for intensive training for teachers and administration that are working or will work with in the urban area. "Framework for the Urban Learner" is excellent. Then connect current research with Gardner's, Perkin's & Streambey's Cognitive Research, with Cultural & Anthropological & Sociological research.
- Over all very good instruction is given. I wish more Wk.End Correspondence work could be given for teachers and administrators to fit the working professional's schedule.
- Additional courses on behavior therapy/strategies as well as resources for challenging situations. (i.e. outside referrals)
- Additional course offerings-Have a hard time scheduling in some classes.
- More classes offered each semester
- In Ed. Admin. drop requirement for statistics in exchange for IEP and the Law (a must for administrators)
- More flexibility in course offerings
- An additional course in the paperwork and fed./state mandates re: special education
- All technology + classroom instruction
- A course in dealing with violent students (crisis management)
- More diverse instructors
- Classes that actually addressed the topic-ex. Investigations of Reading... All I learned was how to write a paper that was at least 20 pgs. Long. Improvement in teaching that actually discussed ways to improve your teaching, not collecting articles.
- Slap in Face 101-new students Slap in Face 301-new administrators
- Run very efficiently, that is why I have gotten my MSE and am enrolled in my Ed. Specialists.
- More law--It's changing everyday More Finance It's complicated More M.A.P. Ideas It's needed
- Increase offerings in Independence and Blue Springs area for doctoral programs.
- *Face issues of : Discipline, teacher accountability, give specific options to use.
- I have found that I needed a stronger background in Special Ed., IEP's, IDEA etc. we discussed these issues in classes however I felt lacking in my administrative position.

- Budget experiences beyond School Finance-more building level uses rather than just foundation formula and district-wide financing.
- Internship, more classes related to SPED
- More frequently offered courses, more weekend classes
- IEP & the Law would be a good addition
- More emphasis on administering and understanding Special Ed. laws, etc. Classes that better address remediation of marginal teachers. (I don't want to doct, but increase internship!) More on staff development also aligned with MO. laws.
- More courses in finance and media/community relations
- I feel a class should be developed to take at the end of your degree to help you prepare for the assessment center, paperwork for accreditation etc.
- A closer tab on what tenured professors do and say in their classrooms. I truly respected the majority of my instructors and personnel at CMSU. But, there is a small majority who needs to be re-evaluated.
- Technology in the public school
- Create course offerings in other locations across the state.
- Allow more choice in classes necessary for degree, dependent upon past majors and experience.
- Offer some of the courses later in the day during the summer. Some of us have to work summer school.
- Monitor evaluations of curriculum classes and change professors!
- Add on elective: pay of elementary school MS/HS Student's Parent
- Be very flexible on internship requirements.
- Technology courses-teaching staff needs a computer connected to the Internet and large classroom monitor to use during classroom instruction.
- A second school law class. More on budget and federal programs that an administrator deals with.
- Add Law level three. Add Finance level three in Ed. Admin. Add technology specific courses like Windows Excel in the Ed. Building Program.
- Curriculum components, alignment to objectives, etc. Needed <u>practical</u> experience. This varied with the particular instructor teaching the course.
- More practical classes, visits to classes from educators and administrators who are still in the field. Maybe fresh from the CMSU program and beginning a new administrative job.
- Faculty should have more experience in the school setting or have returned to school setting in order to be more up-to-date on actual daily operations in schools.
- Cohort programs for Ed. Specialist and Doctoral Candidates-more information
- For the master's program, more time spent addressing day-to-day needs that will be faced, i.e. growing role of assistant principal, core data (requirements & explanations).
- Get instructors in the curriculum department up to date and provide them with activities that are more relevant to the student's needs and everyday reality of the job.
- Training of instructors to model best practices in field-cooperative groups, role-play, etc. 1. Analyze data of test scores 2. Portfolio assessment.
- Remember that many of your students are currently working in the area of study—time commitment should be important, yet not punish those attempting to meet contract commitments.
- More hands on (real-world) activities/internships.
- Additional courses-guidance/counseling course, course dealing with techniques of interpersonal comm. Especially with difficult parents, teachers, students. Course on techniques to help weak teachers.

- Bring in more practicing administrators to teach sub units with in the courses. Look for people with actual field experience in the areas of attendance policies, lawsuits, school finance and so forth!
- Model using technology in instruction.
- Increase use of technology, more field experiences
- None at this time
- Combine a couple of the courses into one, then add a course on school-wide technology use, have latent bondware of software available to students.
- Public school finance should be more basic and be more of an overview course. Get rid of bitter professors like Dr. ?.
- More courses in school law & finance
- More frequent offerings of Ed. Sp. Courses.
- More technology-prepare better for assessment test-more weekend offerings.
- More flexible scheduling. More off-campus courses
- More courses offered in Blue Springs. More research papers and in-basket activities to prepare for the ISLLC Exam.
- Cut out the theory and research staff and deal more with real present day school issues and problems.
- The department should try to offer more weekend courses during the summer and also more courses for the Ed. Specialist degree at off campus sites.
- Provide more school law at undergrad level.
- Get away from theory and psychology and teach practical applications.
- People skills are so important.
- Perhaps the professors need to observe the schools in action once a semester to observe how administrators, faculty, and students function in the school today. Two of my professors had not set foot in a public high school for many years, and they were surprised at some of the situations we were describing that were taking place today. It wasn't by the textbook! It was real life!
- Provide more courses on administrative aspects of financial matters of education.
- A required 1 credit "lab" course that mimics the leadership academy done for 4-6 hours on same Saturday.
- For administration need to take a course in special education.
- Offer specialist courses more frequently. Provide opportunity to work with group of individuals (students) throughout program.

Follow-up Survey by Superintendents of Principals

Of the 92 Superintendents contacted, 58 (63% Return) completed the survey.

All statements are related to National Policy Board of Education Administration (NPBEA) standards. Please rate your perception of your principal's level of competence for each statement:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

4.4 The principal demonstrates professional and ethical leadership.

4.1 The principal demonstrates an understanding of information management and evaluation.

4.2 The principal demonstrates an understanding of curriculum, instruction, supervision, and the learning environment.

4.1 The principal demonstrates an understanding of professional development and human resources.

4.3 The principal demonstrates an understanding of student personnel services.

4.2 The principal demonstrates an understanding of organizational management.

4.1 The principal demonstrates an understanding of interpersonal relationships.

3.8 The principal has an understanding of financial management and resources allocation.

4.0 The principal demonstrates an understanding of technology and information systems.

4.1 The principal demonstrates an understanding of community and media relations.

4.2 The principal demonstrates an understanding of educational law, public policy and political systems.

Follow-up Survey by School Board Presidents of Superintendents

Of the 14 School Board Presidents contacted, 12 (86% Return) completed the survey.

All statements are related to National Policy Board of Education Administration (NPBEA) standards. Please rate your perception of your superintendent's level of competence for each statement:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=adequate, 2= not strong, 1= very weak

4.2 The superintendent demonstrates professional and ethical leadership.

4.2 The superintendent demonstrates an understanding of information management and evaluation.

4.0 The superintendent demonstrates an understanding of curriculum, instruction, supervision, and the learning environment.

3.9 The superintendent demonstrates an understanding of professional development and human resources.

3.8 The superintendent demonstrates an understanding of student personnel services.

4.4 The superintendent demonstrates an understanding of organizational management.

3.7 The superintendent demonstrates an understanding of interpersonal relationships.

4.0 The superintendent has an understanding of financial management and resources allocation.

3.2 The superintendent demonstrates an understanding of technology and information systems.

3.8 The superintendent demonstrates an understanding of community and media relations.

3.7 The superintendent demonstrates an understanding of educational law, public policy and political systems.

This following set of material was designed, distributed, collected and tallied by John R. Zelazek as part of a State of Missouri grant secured by Chris Belcher.

February 2000

Dear Educator,

On behalf of the Alternative Certification Program at Central Missouri State University, I ask your assistance in the assessment process we are currently undertaking. Please return the survey to me in the prepaid envelope by March 1, 2000.

This task is in compliance with The State of Missouri law (Excellence in Education Act of 1985), The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), our national accreditation agency for teacher education (NCATE), and our regional accreditation agency, (North Central). **We need to conduct a follow-up of students who are/were in, or applied to our Alternative Certification Program.** These data will be used for the purpose of program improvement.

I will also be contacting your school employer, if you are employed in a school, to make him/her aware of our surveys, and ask him/her to participate in the employers' survey. All responses will be confidential. If you wish a copy of our results, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope, and I will send you a copy as soon as they are compiled.

Sincerely,

Dr. Chris Belcher
Associate Professor of Secondary Education
Alternative Certification follow-up Chair

Alternative Certification Teachers

Of the 56 Alternative Certification Teachers contacted, 23 (41% Return) completed the survey.

Please read each statement, then circle or fill-in your response for each item.

1. Males—9, Females--14 2. Average age 40.4 years.

3. What is your current BASE salary per school year? Average salary--$26,431.

4. How would you describe yourself? Hispanic—3, White—20.

5. During which semester did you enter the Alternative Teacher Certification program?

   1993—1, 1994—1, 1995—5, 1996—5, 1997—4, 1998—5, 1999—7.

6. What subject(s) do you teach?

   Secondary education—23, (Math, languages, science, business)

7. How much longer do you expect to teach?

   < Five years—1, 5-10 years—1, 11-20 years--14, more than 20--6.

8. In the past year, have you been employed in some capacity besides your teaching assignment? No—14, Yes--8.

9. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in the Alternative Certification program? Definitely yes—17, Probably yes—5, Probably not—1.

10. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY---5=very satisfied; 4=satisfied; 3=neutral; 2=dissatisfied; 1=very dissatisfied

3.3	Salary/fringe benefits
4.0	Quality/level of administrative support
4.1	Level of personal challenge
3.5	Methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
4.0	General work conditions
3.6	Intellectual stimulation of the workplace
4.2	Geographical location
3.6	Opportunities for professional advancement
3.4	Level of support from parents and the community
4.0	Level of support from administrators and colleague
4.1	Interactions with colleagues/students
3.8	Your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion

Please rate your perception of your level of competence for each of the following areas and circle your answer.

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.2 I understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for my students.

4.2 I understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of my students.

3.9 I understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to my diverse learners.

4.3 I use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage my student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

3.8 I recognize the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develop, implement, and evaluate curriculum based upon my student's district's, and state's performance standards.

4.2 I use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

3.9 I model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.1 I understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of my learners.

4.1 I am a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of my students.

4.0 I foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Open Response: Please provide comments to the following statements. If you need more space please add additional sheets.

Overall, describe how well the Alternative Certification Program prepared your teacher for their first year of teaching.

- I feel due to limited time the program did an adequate job, however I do feel course structure could do test measures, 1st day routines, etc. prior to 1st job if possible.
- I was already teaching. This program didn't prepare me but enhanced what I was already doing.
- Gave me the opportunity to update my skills.
- I wish I had had more experience in grading the performance of students in business classes.
- I believe that the program provided valuable information regarding teaching philosophies. The only practical course was Dr. Belcher's Behavior Management class.

- Because my subject area is vocal music some of the courses were not very relevant for me, but overall I felt well prepared.
- Helped me co-ordinate my classes and professional non-teaching skills to benefit my certification with a minimum of "Mickey Mouse" stuff.
- Because I already had over 6 years of teaching experience, very few of the courses offered additional resources I could use. However I would strongly encourage other universities to incorporate classes such as classroom discipline conducted by Dr. Belcher.
- It meets the standards set down by State Officials.
- Fair, it was somewhat overwhelming at times. I moved to a new community, which added to the unknowns. Teaching is such a vicious cycle that it is hard to prepare for it. Prepare, Teach, Assess and do it all over again.
- Very pleased it has met my needs and the support and encouragement I have received from the faculty and staff at CMSU has been great.
- Gave me a basis of education (teaching).
- Not very well…I learned "a million time" more probably within the first month of the "on the job" portion of the program. And my second year I was introduced to Harry Wong's book about the "First Day of School".
- I felt prepared. Excellent program through CMSU (I did have 8 years experience as a substitute).
- Since I had already taught 1 year I was aware of the many problems facing a teacher. The certification program has done what it could to prepare me for my 2nd year.
- The Behavior Management class has been helpful.
- None, I began after first year. Well except my administration is anti-coop learning.
- It was wonderful. I am a native speaker and ACP gave me the chance to teach.
- The theories taught in college are not necessarily applied in the school systems yet.
- Topic covered were very helpful especially classroom management.

What additional types of teaching activities/information should the teacher have been exposed to prior to their current teaching experience?

- Candidates for this program should be able to work with or observe an experienced teacher. Meetings between candidates and their advisers would occur more often. Candidates getting together to help each other is a good idea.
- I taught Voc. Tech while working in industry and I also taught people I worked with in workshops put on by my company.
- I needed more re: classroom management about "consequences/rewards….Also more about grading ideas (weighting or points) record keeping, etc, Also needed more information about curriculum and state standards. Harry Wong's book… maybe more "real" input form teachers.
- Just to relax and be more confident in my skills.
- Perfomanced based grading.
- Special training for urban schoolteachers.
- Current technologies in teaching math in the high school
- Testing procedures, 1st day activities.
- None, because I was already a certified teacher in another state with seven years of experience.
- Classroom observation experience. Seeing successful teachers teach, how they handle discipline and day-to-day routines.
- Perhaps more activities regarding assessments in the arts.

- None: I had substitute teaching experience (4 years) and was a self-employed art teacher for 4 years (at Catholic Schools).
- Teaching strategies for teaching in a large minority/economically disadvantaged setting.
- My biggest challenge was establishing discipline. I had come from retail where the customer acts as he pleases.
- I had been a Spanish Instructor for MU since 1984. I am also a veterinarian and have taught medicine.
- Many more courses in the law. (Special Education) Courses in conduct.
- Book selection.

Overall, how would you describe the quality of their training in the Alternative Certification Program?

- Six individuals stated either good, very good, ok, good or satisfied.

- Excellent and I appreciate the great help and cooperation I received, especially from Dr. Keisker.
- I think that people who have a natural ability to teach could have that ability enhanced by the program. I think that some of the course work was irrelevant (i.e., not helpful to me....)
- Neutral –but this program should be more accessible to others. There are "lots" of people just like me wanting to change careers to fit personal needs that would make excellent teachers because of their life experience. Especially for middle and high school levels.
- I would describe it as satisfactory.
- Most of my classes were very helpful. However, I felt the two psychology classes I took w/Dr. Kemp did very little to prepare me for teaching. I learned the most in weekend courses w/Dr. Belcher where he demonstrated teaching techniques.
- I was very impressed with the faculty and facility. The information was important for anyone in the teaching profession.
- Quality of training---very good. Usefulness—weak (except Dr. Belcher's classroom discipline).
- Excellent, all involved are very helpful.
- OK...some good, helpful ideas/information but also a lot of "wasted" hours in class and classwork that
  could have been more beneficially used in planning specific lessons and long – term planning.
- It was fine. The program is new, but is trying to get better. But more classes need to be available in the evenings and in the summer, in both the education and in the candidates core study. I've had trouble getting classes that fit my working schedule.
- Very good. The Ed. Classes were beneficial. I appreciate the practical applications. Our profs were exceptional and rational. I did not feel that my time was wasted. Thanks CMSU.
- Very satisfied in General Education but I would have liked to have had a more subject specific classroom management class—not that yours was poor Dr. Belcher.
- It was very good. What I most appreciate is the way I was always helped. The environment at that school is ???????. You get out exactly what you put in.

February 2000

Dear Principal,

On behalf of the Alternative Certification Program at Central Missouri State University, I ask your assistance in the assessment process we are currently undertaking. Please return the survey to me in the prepaid envelope by March 1, 2000.

This task is in compliance with The State of Missouri law (Excellence in Education Act of 1985), The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), our national accreditation agency for teacher education (NCATE), and our regional accreditation agency, (North Central). **We need to conduct a follow-up of students who are/were in our Alternative Certification Program.** These data will be used for the purpose of program improvement.

I will also be contacting your teacher(s) to make him/her aware of our surveys, and ask him/her to participate in the educator's survey. All responses will be confidential. If you wish a copy of our results, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope, and I will send you a copy as soon as they are compiled.

Sincerely,

Dr. Chris Belcher
Associate Professor of Secondary Education
Alternative Certification follow-up Chair

Principals views of the Alternative Certification Teachers

Of the 43 Principals contacted, 21 (49% Return) completed the survey.

Please rate your perception of your teacher's level of competence for each of the following areas:

Key---5 = very strong, 4=strong, 3=neutral, 2= not strong, 1=weak

4.2 The teacher(s) understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for their students.

4.3 The teacher(s) understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of their students.

3.8 The teacher(s) understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

4.3 The teacher(s) recognizes the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develops, implements, and evaluates curriculum based upon students, district, and state performance standards.

4.3 The teacher(s) use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage their students to development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

3.9 The teacher(s) uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

4.2 The teacher(s) model effective verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

4.3 The teacher(s) understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

4.2 The teacher(s) is a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others, and seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more of their students.

4.2 The teacher(s) fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and their well being.

Open Response: Please provide comments to the following statements. If you do not have a response please leave the statement blank. If you need more space please write on the backside of this sheet or add additional paper.

Overall, describe how well the Alternative Certification Program prepared your teacher for their first year of teaching.

- Allowed a non-teaching person with a degree to secure their teaching endorsement and gain the knowledge necessary to be an excellent educator.
- Very well
- Very well, Experience and maturity.
- Much better than I anticipated.
- We are still in progress.
- Our teachers began teaching before they officially entered the program.
- Mr. _____ was much older than most and his previous background gave much insight into adolescent behavior and learning.
- Both of the teachers in this program have done a good job since the beginning.
- Teacher is doing quite well.
- Well prepared.
- This teacher is uniquely well suited for the position he occupies. I recall several conversations with him relating things he had picked up in classes.
- They began teaching before beginning courses.
- Excellent preparation. Quality superb instruction.
- Good.
- Very Well.

What additional types of teaching activities/information should the teacher have been exposed to prior to their current teaching experience?

- Could use something similar to student teaching but not take as long.
- New PBTE—ITV activities. Electronic Classroom Activities (White Boards/Projection device.
- More discipline techniques/people skills.
- More "Student Teaching" type, hands on, real life, experience.
- Working in large groups 20 plus and workload expectancies.
- I cannot think of anything as these teachers have done an excellent job since their first year.
- His biggest initial problem was in classroom management and assessment strategies—however, he was already teaching when be started your program so any instruction from CMSU would have been after-the-fact.
- School law.
- More practice (Student Teaching)
- Classroom Management skills.

Overall, how would you describe the quality of their training in the Alternative Certification Program?

- Five individuals responded Good or Very Good.
- Three responded Excellent or Outstanding.
- Overall, using your scale above, "4" for strong.
- Very satisfied at this point.
- Is probably as effective as is possible given the difficult circumstances.
- Excellent—Progress was apparent as they continued in the program.
- Teacher appears well prepared to teach.
- High Quality.
- I recall the teacher feeling very supported and appreciative of his adviser in the program.

February 2000

Dear Educator,

On behalf of the Alternative Certification Program at Central Missouri State University, I ask your assistance in the assessment process we are currently undertaking. Please return the survey to me in the prepaid envelope by March 1, 2000.

This task is in compliance with The State of Missouri law (Excellence in Education Act of 1985), The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), our national accreditation agency for teacher education (NCATE), and our regional accreditation agency, (North Central). **We need to conduct a follow-up of students who are/were in, or applied to our Alternative Certification Program.** These data will be used for the purpose of program improvement.

I will also be contacting your school employer, if you are employed in a school, to make him/her aware of our surveys, and ask him/her to participate in the employers' survey. All responses will be confidential. If you wish a copy of our results, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope, and I will send you a copy as soon as they are compiled.

Sincerely,

Dr. Chris Belcher
Associate Professor of Secondary Education
Alternative Certification follow-up Chair

Alternative Certification Teacher Applicants (Did not Process/Denied)

Of the 35 Alternative Certification Teachers contacted, 6 (17 % Return) completed the survey.

Responses from candidates who did not complete the program or process their AC applications fully:

Please explain why you did not complete the Alternative Certification Program.

- I decided to go back to school and earn a BS in Business Education.
- I never really started. I did not actually take my courses at CMSU because I decided after doing some substitute teaching and then being unable to find a decent job that I would take a different career path. I am now finishing my doctorate in business.
- I was not approved for the program. I have been in the business world for 13 years now and was not accepted into their program. I would like to know if the program has changed since I applied a few years ago. I would like to be sent some information on the program.
- My grade point average was 2.20 and your program required 2.50 GPA. Never have I been so glad that my GPA was low. I would be hating every minute of being an educator.
- I was not accepted for the program due to a lack of practical work experience according to the director at that time. I would probably be a full-time teacher today had I been given a chance to complete your program. From the information I received, there were only so many slots available in the program. That is too bad, because I feel I would have been an excellent teacher. I have since moved into another field. Hopefully, in the future you will be able to accommodate all applicants, as there is an overwhelming need for teachers in the public school systems of the State of Missouri.
- The best way to explain why I did not complete the ACP is to send a copy of the letter I sent to Dr. Keisker at the time. You will find a copy attached to this note. I am taking every opportunity to return the favor, as I mentioned in my letter to Dr. Keisker. Anytime anyone asks why I am no longer teaching, or why I quit teaching to pursue a Ph.D. in Mining Engineering (Explosives Research) and to teach at UMR, I do not hesitate to bend his ear about your "program". COPY of LETTER SENT: (5/31/97 Dr. Keisker: In re your offer of admission to the Alternative Teacher Certification Program: thanks, but no thanks. I still find it hard to believe that 1 ½ years ago you told me that your program would not require a student to retake courses covering material that he had already taken, and then insist that I come to your facility to do exactly that! The pill is even more bitter because I spent quite a lot of money, and a lot of evening and weekend time away from my family to acquire those education courses based on your word. I sincerely hope I am in a position, sometime in the future, to return the favor. It is a shame that you Education gurus at the university level are not in line with the general wish that people with outside experience be brought into teaching from the non-education degree areas. It is my understanding that few universities in Missouri have alternative certification programs, and I also hear that those programs will disappear soon if you in Education have your way. If so, that would be a shame; on the contrary, we need to find more ways to get people with outside experience to teach at the public schools